arXiv:1303.6998v1 [math.AG] 27 Mar 2013

ACM BUNDLES ON CUBIC THREEFOLDS AND FOURFOLDS CONTAINING A PLANE

MARTÍ LAHOZ, EMANUELE MACRÌ, AND PAOLO STELLARI

Abstract. We study ACM bundles on cubic threefolds and fourfolds containing a plane. For this purpose, we propose a new approach based on derived category techniques. In the case of cubic threefolds, these techniques allow us to show that the moduli space of Ulrich bundles is always non-empty. Applied to cubic fourfolds containing a plane, they give us a way to recover the K3 surface naturally associated to the fourfold as a moduli space of stable ACM bundles of rank four.

Introduction

Fourier–Mukai techniques to study stable vector bundles on surfaces have been an extremely useful tool for more than 30 years. In this paper, we use a construction by Kuznetsov to generalize such circle of ideas and study Arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay (ACM) stable vector bundles on smooth projective cubic hypersurfaces. The basic idea is to use a semiorthogonal decomposition of the derived category of coherent sheaves to "reduce dimension". The disadvantage of this approach is that we have to consider complexes and a notion of stability for them; this forces us to restrict to the cubic threefold case and to special examples in the fourfold case. The advantage is that this may lead to a general approach to study ACM stable bundles in higher dimensions.

ACM bundles and semiorthogonal decompositions. Let $Y \subset \mathbb{P}^{n+1}$ be a smooth complex cubic n-fold, and let $\mathcal{O}_Y(H)$ denote the corresponding very ample line bundle. A vector bundle F on a Y is called *Arithmetically Cohen–Macaulay* if $\dim H^i(Y, F(jH)) = 0$, for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. In algebraic geometry, the interest in studying stable ACM bundles (and their moduli spaces) on projective varieties arose from the papers [11, 25, 30, 31, 46]. In fact, in [25] it is proved that the moduli space of rank 2 instanton sheaves on a cubic threefold is isomorphic to the blow-up of the intermediate Jacobian in (minus) the Fano surface of lines. The intermediate Jacobian can be used both to control the isomorphism type of the cubic, via the Clemens–Griffiths/Tyurin Torelli Theorem, and to prove the non-rationality of the cubic (see [24]). From a more algebraic viewpoint, ACM bundles correspond to *Maximal Cohen-Macaulay* (MCM) modules over the graded ring associated to the projectively embedded variety, and as such they have been extensively studied in the past years (see, e.g., [56]).

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 18E30, 14E08.

Key words and phrases. Arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay vector bundles, cubic threefolds, cubic fourfolds.

M. L. is partially supported by SFB/TR 45, Fondation Mathématique Jacques Hadamard (FMJH) and MTM2012-38122-C03-02. E. M. is partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1001482/DMS-1160466, the Hausdorff Center for Mathematics, Universität Bonn, and SFB/TR 45. P. S. is partially supported by the grants FIRB 2012 "Moduli Spaces and Their Applications" and the national research project "Geometria delle Varietà Proiettive" (PRIN 2010-11).

In a different direction, Kuznetsov studied in [34] semiorthogonal decompositions of the derived category of a cubic hypersurface. In fact, as we review in Section 1.1, there exists a non-trivial triangulated subcategory $\mathbf{T}_Y \subset \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(Y)$, which might encode the birational information of the cubic. For example, in the case of a cubic threefold Y, it is proven in [13] that the isomorphism class of Y can be recovered directly from $\mathbf{T}_Y$ as a sort of "categorical version" of the Clemens–Griffiths/Tyurin Torelli Theorem. In [35] it is conjectured that a cubic fourfold is rational if and only if the category $\mathbf{T}_Y$ is equivalent to the derived category of a K3 surface. In the fourfold case, a relation with this conjecture and the classical Hodge theoretical approach to rationality appears in [2]. For the interpretation of $\mathbf{T}_Y$ as a category of matrix factorization, we refer to [49]. For the interpretation as a summand of the Chow motive of Y, we refer to [12].

For cubic threefolds and fourfolds containing a plane, a different description of $\mathbf{T}_Y$ is available, via Kuznetsov's semiorthogonal decomposition of the derived category of a quadric fibration (see [36]). Indeed, as we review in Section 1.3, $\mathbf{T}_Y$ is equivalent to a full subcategory of the derived category of sheaves on $\mathbb{P}^2$ with the action of a sheaf of Clifford algebras $\mathcal{B}_0$ (determined by fixing a structure of quadric fibration on the cubic). We denote the induced fully-faithful functor $\Xi : \mathbf{T}_Y \hookrightarrow \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ (for fourfolds, Ξ is an equivalence). The key observation (which is not surprising if we think to ACM bundles as MCM modules, see [20, Section 2] and [49]) is the following: given a stable ACM bundle F on Y, a certain twist of F by the very ample line bundle $\mathcal{O}_Y(H)$ belongs to $\mathbf{T}_Y$ (this is Lemma 1.6). Hence, the idea is to study basic properties of ACM bundles on Y (e.g., existence, irreducibility of the moduli spaces, etc.) by using the functor Ξ, and so by considering them as complexes of $\mathcal{B}_0$-modules on $\mathbb{P}^2$. The principle is that, since $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ has dimension 2, although it is not intrinsic to the cubic, it should still lead to several simplifications. The main question now becomes whether there exists a notion of stability for objects in $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ which corresponds to the usual stability for ACM bundles. In this paper we suggest, both for cubic threefolds and fourfolds containing a plane, that such a notion of stability in $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ should be *Bridgeland stability* [17].

Cubic threefolds. Let Y be a cubic threefold. By fixing a line l_0 in Y, the projection from l_0 to $\mathbb{P}^2$ gives a structure of a conic fibration on (a blow-up of) Y. The sheaf of algebras $\mathcal{B}_0$ on $\mathbb{P}^2$ mentioned before is nothing but the sheaf of even parts of the Clifford algebras associated to this conic fibration (see [35]). Denote by $\mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ the abelian category of coherent $\mathcal{B}_0$-modules, and by $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ the corresponding bounded derived category.

As a first step in the study of ACM bundles on Y, we consider the moduli spaces $\mathfrak{M}_d$ of Gieseker stable $\mathcal{B}_0$-modules in $\mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ with Chern character $(0, 2d, -2d)$, for any $d \geqslant 1$. These moduli spaces are tightly related to the geometry of Y and the first general result we can prove is the following (see Theorem 2.11).

Theorem A. *The moduli space $\mathfrak{M}_d$ is irreducible with a morphism $\Upsilon : \mathfrak{M}_d \to |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(d)|$ whose fiber on a general curve C in $|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(d)|$ is the disjoint union of 2^{4d} copies of the Jacobian of C. Moreover, the stable locus $\mathfrak{M}_d^s$ is smooth of dimension $d^2 + 1$.*

The geometry of $\mathfrak{M}_1$ and $\mathfrak{M}_2$ can be understood more explicitly. Indeed, it turns out that $\mathfrak{M}_1$ is the Fano variety of lines in Y blown-up at the line l_0 (see Proposition 2.12). On the other hand $\mathfrak{M}_2$ is a birational model of the intermediate Jacobian of Y (see Theorem 3.9 for a more detailed statement and Remark 3.12). Both results are obtained via wall-crossing in the space of Bridgeland stability conditions on the triangulated category $\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$. As a corollary, one gets that the moduli space of instanton sheaves on Y (of charge 2) is isomorphic to a moduli space of Bridgeland stable objects in $\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ with prescribed Chern character (see Corollary 3.10).

As $\mathbf{T}_Y$ can be naturally identified with a full subcategory of $\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$, via the functor Ξ, one may want to consider objects of $\mathfrak{M}_d$ which are contained in $\mathbf{T}_Y$. These generically correspond to ACM bundles on Y. This is the way we can achieve the following theorem which generalizes one of the main results in [21].

Theorem B. *Let Y be a cubic threefold. Then, for any $r \geqslant 2$, the moduli space of stable rank r Ulrich bundles is non-empty and smooth of dimension $r^2 + 1$.*

Recall that an *Ulrich bundle E* is an ACM bundle whose graded module $\bigoplus_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} H^0(Y, E(m))$ has $3\,\mathrm{rk}(E)$ generators in degree 1 (see Section 2.5 for a discussion about the normalization chosen). If compared to the first part of [21, Thm. 1.2], our result removes the genericity assumption.

We believe that Theorem A will also be useful in studying the irreducibility of the moduli space of stable Ulrich bundles. In fact, we expect the functor Ξ to map all stable Ulrich bundles on Y into Bridgeland stable objects in $\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$, thus generalizing Corollary 3.10 to the case $r > 2$.

It is maybe worth pointing out that the proof of Theorem B, which is contained in Section 2.5, is based upon the same deformation argument as in [21]. The main difference is that, by using our categorical approach and the moduli spaces $\mathfrak{M}_d$, we can make it work also for small rank ($r = 2, 3$). Indeed, the argument in [21] relies on the existence of an ACM curve on Y of degree 12 and genus 10, proved by Geiß and Schreyer in the appendix to [21], only for a generic cubic threefold, using `Macaulay2`. Moreover, although we have focused on cubic threefolds, we believe that our approach might work for any quadric fibration. In particular, other interesting Fano threefolds of Picard rank 1 are the intersection of three quadrics in $\mathbb{P}^6$, the quartic hypersurface containing a double line, or the double covering of $\mathbb{P}^3$ ramified along a quartic with an ordinary double point (see [9]).

Cubic fourfolds containing a plane. We consider now the case of a cubic fourfold Y containing a plane P. The plane can be used as in the threefold case to give the structure of quadric fibration π over $\mathbb{P}^2$. The corresponding functor $\Xi : \mathbf{T}_Y \to \mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ is now an equivalence (see [35]). The category $\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ can be described more geometrically. Indeed, the singular quadrics of the fibration π lie over a sextic plane curve which we denote by C. Generically, the sextic will be smooth. In such a case, we let S be the smooth projective K3 surface obtained as double cover of $\mathbb{P}^2$ ramified along C. By [35], we have then an equivalence $\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0) \cong \mathrm{D^b}(S, \mathcal{A}_0)$, where $\mathcal{A}_0$ is a sheaf of Azumaya algebras over S. The K3 surface S plays an important role in the study of moduli spaces of ACM bundles on cubic fourfolds as explained in the following result.

Theorem C. *Let Y be a cubic fourfold in $\mathbb{P}^5$ containing a plane P. Then the K3 surface S is the closure of a component of the moduli space of Gieseker stable ACM bundles over Y with class $\left(4, -2H, -P, l, \frac{1}{4}\right)$, where l is the class of a line in Y.*

The theorem can be deduced by a quite long computation carried out all along Section 4. As far as we know, this is the first example of a 2-dimensional family of stable ACM bundles of rank 4 on a cubic fourfold. Moreover, we observe that the smooth locus of any moduli space of slope-stable ACM vector bundles on Y carries a symplectic form (see Remark 1.8).

A way to rephrase Theorem C is that the embedding of $\mathbf{T}_Y$ into $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(Y)$ can be realized as a fully faithful Fourier–Mukai functor whose kernel is a shift of a sheaf: namely the universal family in the moduli problem in Theorem C.

Related works. The idea of using semiorthogonal decompositions to study ACM bundles by reducing dimension is influenced by [38]. More precisely, in *loc. cit.*, Kuznetsov proposes to understand the geometry of moduli spaces of instanton bundles (of any charge) on cubic threefolds via the category $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ and the functor Ξ.

There have been many studies about ACM bundles of rank 2 in dimension 2 and 3. Besides the already mentioned results on instanton bundles on cubic threefolds, some papers in this direction are [6, 15, 22, 23, 44]. The higher rank case has been investigated in [5, 6, 45]. The papers [48] and [51] give few examples of indecomposable ACM bundles of arbitrarily high rank. The already mentioned papers [20, 21] contain a systematic study of stable ACM bundles in higher rank on cubic surfaces and threefolds. A general existence result for Ulrich bundles on hypersurfaces is in [27].

Regarding preservation of stability via the functor Ξ, the papers [13, 43] study the case of ideal sheaves of lines on a cubic threefold or fourfold containing a plane.

Plan of the paper. The paper is organized as follows. Section 1 collects basic facts about semiorthogonal decompositions and general results about ACM bundles on cubic hypersurfaces. In particular, we show that stable ACM bundles are objects of $\mathbf{T}_Y$ (up to twists) and state a simple cohomological criterion for a coherent sheaf in $\mathbf{T}_Y$ to be ACM (see Lemmas 1.6 and 1.9). In Section 1.3 we review Kuznetsov's work on quadric fibrations.

Section 2 concerns the case of cubic threefolds where the first two results mentioned above are proved. The argument is based on a detailed description of the easiest case of $\mathfrak{M}_1$ which involves Bridgeland stability conditions (see Section 2.2). Some background on the latter subject is provided in the same section. In Sections 2.4 and 2.5 we prove Theorems A and B respectively. The geometric applications to some simple wall-crossing phenomena are described in detail in Section 3, where we study the geometry of $\mathfrak{M}_2$ and its relation to instanton bundles. Section 4 is devoted to the proof of Theorem C.

Notation. Throughout this paper we work over the complex numbers. For a smooth projective variety X, we denote by $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)$ the bounded derived category of coherent sheaves on X. We refer to [28] for basics on derived categories. If X is not smooth, we denote by X_{reg} the regular part of X. This paper assumes some familiarity with basic constructions and definitions about moduli spaces of stable bundles. For example, we do not define explicitly the notion of slope and Gieseker stability, of Harder–Narasimhan (HN) and Jordan–Hölder (JH) factors of a (semistable) vector bundle. For this, we refer to [29]. The same book is our main reference for the standard construction of moduli spaces of stable sheaves. For the twisted versions of them we refer directly to [52, 41, 57].

In the following, we will use the short-hand notation *(semi)stable* to refer to *stable* (respectively, *semistable*). Gieseker stability will be simply called stability, while slope stability will be called μ-stability.

1. The derived category of a cubic hypersurface

In this section we show that, on a smooth cubic hypersurface Y, all stable ACM bundles are well behaved with respect to Kuznetsov's semiorthogonal decomposition of the derived category. In particular, after recalling the notion of semiorthogonal decomposition of a derived category, we show that stable ACM bundles on Y belong to the non-trivial component $\mathbf{T}_Y$ of $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(Y)$, up to twist by line bundles. We also introduce one of the basic tools to study the derived category of cubic threefolds and fourfolds containing a plane: Kuznetsov's description of the derived category of a quadric fibration.

1.1. Semiorthogonal decompositions.

Let X be a smooth projective variety and let $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)$ be its bounded derived category of coherent sheaves.

Definition 1.1. A *semiorthogonal* decomposition of $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)$ is a sequence of full triangulated subcategories $\mathbf{T}_1, \dots, \mathbf{T}_m \subseteq \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)$ such that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)}(\mathbf{T}_i, \mathbf{T}_j) = 0$, for $i > j$ and, for all $G \in \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)$, there exists a chain of morphisms in $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)$

$$0 = G_m \to G_{m-1} \to \dots \to G_1 \to G_0 = G$$

with $\mathrm{cone}(G_i \to G_{i-1}) \in \mathbf{T}_i$, for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. We will denote such a decomposition by $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X) = \langle \mathbf{T}_1, \dots, \mathbf{T}_m \rangle$.

Definition 1.2. An object $F \in \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)$ is *exceptional* if $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)}(F,F) \cong \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathrm{Hom}^p_{\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)}(F,F) = 0$, for all $p \neq 0$. A collection $\{F_1, \dots, F_m\}$ of objects in $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)$ is called an *exceptional collection* if F_i is an exceptional object, for all i, and $\mathrm{Hom}^p_{\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)}(F_i, F_j) = 0$, for all p and all $i > j$.

Remark 1.3. An exceptional collection $\{F_1, \dots, F_m\}$ in $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)$ provides a semiorthogonal decomposition

$$\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X) = \langle \mathbf{T}, F_1, \dots, F_m \rangle,$$

where, by abuse of notation, we denoted by F_i the triangulated subcategory generated by F_i (equivalent to the bounded derived category of finite dimensional vector spaces). Moreover

$$\mathbf{T} := \langle F_1, \dots, F_m \rangle^{\perp} = \left\{ G \in \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X) \,:\, \mathrm{Hom}^p(F_i, G) = 0, \text{ for all } p \text{ and } i \right\}.$$

Similarly, one can define ${}^{\perp}\langle F_1, \dots, F_m \rangle = \{ G \in \mathbf{T} \,:\, \mathrm{Hom}^p(G, F_i) = 0, \text{ for all } p \text{ and } i \}$.

Let $F \in \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)$ be an exceptional object. Consider the two functors, respectively *left and right mutation*, $\mathbf{L}_F, \mathbf{R}_F : \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X) \to \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L}_F(G) &:= \mathrm{cone}\,(\mathrm{ev} : \mathrm{RHom}(F,G) \otimes F \to G) \\ \mathbf{R}_F(G) &:= \mathrm{cone}\,\left(\mathrm{ev}^{\vee} : G \to \mathrm{RHom}(G,F)^{\vee} \otimes F\right)[-1], \end{aligned} \tag{1.1.1}$$

where $\mathrm{RHom}(-,-) := \oplus_p \mathrm{Hom}^p_{\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)}(-,-)[-p]$. More intrinsically, let $\iota_{{}^{\perp}F}$ and $\iota_{F^{\perp}}$ be the full embeddings of ${}^{\perp}F$ and $F^{\perp}$ into $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(X)$. Denote by $\iota^*_{{}^{\perp}F}$ and $\iota^!_{{}^{\perp}F}$ the left and right adjoints of $\iota_{{}^{\perp}F}$

and by $\iota^*_{F^\perp}$ and $\iota^!_{F^\perp}$ the left and right adjoints of $\iota_{F^\perp}$. Then $\mathbf{L}_F = \iota_{F^\perp} \circ \iota^*_{F^\perp}$, while $\mathbf{R}_F = \iota_{{}^\perp F} \circ \iota^!_{{}^\perp F}$ (see, e.g., [37, Sect. 2]).

The main property of mutations is that, given a semiorthogonal decomposition of $\mathrm{D^b}(X)$

$$\langle \mathbf{T}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{T}_k, F, \mathbf{T}_{k+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{T}_n \rangle,$$

we can produce two new semiorthogonal decompositions

$$\langle \mathbf{T}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{T}_k, \mathbf{L}_F(\mathbf{T}_{k+1}), F, \mathbf{T}_{k+2}, \ldots, \mathbf{T}_n \rangle$$

and

$$\langle \mathbf{T}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{T}_{k-1}, F, \mathbf{R}_F(\mathbf{T}_k), \mathbf{T}_{k+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{T}_n \rangle.$$

Let us make precise the relation between left and right mutations that will be used throughout the paper. Denote by $S_X = (-) \otimes \omega_X[\dim(X)]$ the Serre functor of X. We have the following lemma (which actually works more generally for any admissible subcategory in $\mathrm{D^b}(X)$).

Lemma 1.4. *If F is an exceptional object then $\mathbf{R}_{S_X(F)}$ is right adjoint to $\mathbf{L}_F$ while $\mathbf{R}_F$ is left adjoint to $\mathbf{L}_F$.*

Proof. This follows from the remark that ${}^\perp(S_X(F)) = F^\perp$ and using adjunction between the functors $\iota^*_{\mathbf{D}}$, $\iota_{\mathbf{D}}$ and $\iota^!_{\mathbf{D}}$ for $\mathbf{D}$ equal to ${}^\perp F$ or to $F^\perp$. □

1.2. **ACM bundles on cubics.** Let Y be a *smooth cubic n-fold*, namely a smooth projective hypersurface of degree 3 in $\mathbb{P}^{n+1}$. We set $\mathcal{O}_Y(H) := \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{n+1}}(H)|_Y$. According to Remark 1.3, as observed by Kuznetsov, the derived category $\mathrm{D^b}(Y)$ of coherent sheaves on Y has a semiorthogonal decomposition

$$\mathrm{D^b}(Y) = \langle \mathbf{T}_Y, \mathcal{O}_Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(H), \ldots, \mathcal{O}_Y((n-2)H) \rangle, \tag{1.2.1}$$

where, by definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{T}_Y &:= \langle \mathcal{O}_Y, \ldots, \mathcal{O}_Y(n-2) \rangle^\perp \\ &= \left\{ G \in \mathrm{D^b}(Y) : \mathrm{Hom}^p_{\mathrm{D^b}(Y)}(\mathcal{O}_Y(iH), G) = 0, \text{ for all } p \text{ and } i = 0, \ldots, n-2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us first recall the following definition.

Definition 1.5. (i) A vector bundle F on a smooth projective variety X of dimension n is *arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay* (ACM) if $\dim H^i(X, F(jH)) = 0$, for all $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$ and all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(ii) An ACM bundle F is called *balanced* if $\mu(F) \in [-1, 0)$.

The following lemmas show that the category $\mathbf{T}_Y$ and stable ACM bundles are closely related.

Lemma 1.6. *Let $Y \subset \mathbb{P}^{n+1}$ be a smooth cubic n-fold. Let F be a balanced μ-stable ACM bundle with* $\mathrm{rk}(F) > 1$. *Then $F \in \mathbf{T}_Y$.*

Proof. We want to show that $h^i(Y, F(-jH)) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j \in \{0, \ldots, n-2\}$. Since F is ACM, we already have that $h^i(Y, F(-jH)) = 0$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ and any j. Hence, we only need to prove that $h^0(Y, F(-jH)) = h^n(Y, F(-jH)) = 0$ for $j \in \{0, \ldots, n-2\}$. But, on the one hand, we have

$$h^0(Y, F(-jH)) = \hom(\mathcal{O}_Y(jH), F) = 0,$$

for $j \geqslant 0$, since F is μ-semistable with $\mu(F) < 0$. On the other hand,

$$h^n(Y, F(-jH)) = \mathrm{ext}^n(\mathcal{O}_Y(jH), F) = \hom(F, \mathcal{O}_Y((-n+1+j)H)) = 0,$$

for $-n+1+j < -1$, because F is μ-semistable with $-1 \leqslant \mu(F)$. It remains, to prove that the vector space $\mathrm{Hom}(F, \mathcal{O}_Y((-n+1+j)H))$ is trivial for $j = n-2$. But this is immediate, since F is a μ-stable sheaf of rank greater than 1. □

Remark 1.7. The previous lemma is slightly more general. Indeed, the same proof works for a balanced ACM bundle of rank greater than one, if it is μ-semistable and $\mathrm{Hom}(F, \mathcal{O}_Y(-H)) = 0$.

Remark 1.8. When $n = 4$, the Serre functor of the subcategory $\mathbf{T}_Y$ is isomorphic to the shift by 2 (see [35, Thm. 4.3]). Thus, as an application of the result above and [39, Thm. 4.3], one gets that the smooth locus of any moduli space of μ-stable ACM vector bundles on Y carries a closed symplectic form.

Lemma 1.9. *Let $Y \subset \mathbb{P}^{n+1}$ be a smooth cubic n-fold and let $F \in \mathbf{Coh}(Y) \cap \mathbf{T}_Y$. Assume*

$$\begin{aligned} &H^1(Y, F(H)) = 0 \\ &H^1(Y, F((1-n)H)) = \ldots = H^{n-1}(Y, F((1-n)H)) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{1.2.2}$$

Then F is an ACM bundle.

Proof. We start by proving that $H^i(Y, F(jH)) = 0$, for all $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$ and all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Denote by $i : Y \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{n+1}$ the embedding of Y. For $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we recall the Beilinson spectral sequence from [28, Prop. 8.28]:

$$E_1^{p,q} := H^q(\mathbb{P}^{n+1}, i_*F(p+m)) \otimes \Omega^{-p}_{\mathbb{P}^{n+1}}(-p) \Rightarrow E^{p+q} = \begin{cases} F(m) & \text{if } p+q = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We first consider the case when $m = 1$. Since $F \in \mathbf{T}_Y$, we have $E_1^{p,q} = 0$, for $p = -n+1, \ldots, -1$ and all q. By assumption, $E_1^{p,q} = 0$, also for $p = -n$ and $q = 1, \ldots, n-1$, and $E_1^{0,1} = 0$. As a consequence, all the differentials $d_r^{-n-1,q} = 0$, for all $q = 1, \ldots, n-1$ and all $r > 0$. Hence, $E_1^{-n-1,q} = 0$, for all $q = 1, \ldots, n-1$. A similar argument shows that $E_1^{0,q} = 0$, for all $q = 1, \ldots, n$. Summing up, we have the following vanishing:

$$H^i(Y, F(jH)) = 0, \qquad \text{for all } i = 1, \ldots, n-1 \text{ and all } j = -n, \ldots, 0, 1 \tag{1.2.3}$$

$$H^0(Y, F(jH)) = 0, \qquad \text{for all } j \leqslant 0 \tag{1.2.4}$$

$$H^n(Y, F(jH)) = 0, \qquad \text{for all } j \geqslant -n+2. \tag{1.2.5}$$

Now, on the one hand, by using the Beilinson spectral sequence for $m > 1$ and the vanishing (1.2.3) and (1.2.4), we can prove by induction on m that

$$H^i(Y, F(jH)) = 0, \qquad \text{for all } i = 1, \ldots, n-1 \text{ and all } j \leqslant 0. \tag{1.2.6}$$

On the other hand, for $m < 1$, the vanishing (1.2.3) and (1.2.5) show

$$H^i(Y, F(jH)) = 0, \qquad \text{for all } i = 1, \ldots, n-1 \text{ and all } j > 0.$$

To finish the proof of the lemma, we only need to show that F is locally-free. Hence, it is enough to prove that $\mathcal{E}xt^i(F,\mathcal{O}_Y)=0$, for all $i>0$. For $k\in\mathbb{Z}$, consider the local-to-global spectral sequence

$$E_2^{p,q}(k)=H^p(Y,\mathcal{E}xt^q(F(k),\mathcal{O}_Y))\Rightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^{p+q}(F(k),\mathcal{O}_Y). \tag{1.2.7}$$

Assume, for a contradiction, that $\mathcal{E}xt^i(F,\mathcal{O}_Y)\neq 0$ for some $i>0$. Then, for $k\ll 0$, $E_2^{0,i}(k)\neq 0$, while $E_2^{p,i}(k)=0$ for $p>0$. From the spectral sequence and Serre duality, we deduce that $H^{n-i}(Y,F((k-n+1)H))\neq 0$, for $i=1,\dots,n$ and for $k\ll 0$, contradicting (1.2.6) and (1.2.4). $\square$

Finally, for later use, we recall how to construct autoequivalences of $\mathbf{T}_Y$ (not fixing $\mathbf{Coh}(Y)\cap\mathbf{T}_Y$).

Lemma 1.10. *Let $Y\subset\mathbb{P}^{n+1}$ be a smooth cubic n-fold. Then, the functor*

$$\Theta:\mathbf{T}_Y\to\mathbf{T}_Y,\qquad F\mapsto \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(F\otimes\mathcal{O}_Y(H))$$

is an autoequivalence of $\mathbf{T}_Y$.

Proof. Clearly $\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(F\otimes\mathcal{O}_Y(H))$ belongs to $\mathbf{T}_Y$ and the inverse of Θ is given by the exact functor $\Theta^{-1}(-):=\mathcal{O}_Y(-H)\otimes\mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(-)$. $\square$

Let us revise a classical example under a slightly different perspective.

Example 1.11. Denote by $\mathfrak{M}_Y(v)$ the moduli space of μ-stable torsion-free sheaves E on Y with $v:=\mathrm{ch}(E)=(2,-H,-l/2,1/2)$, and let $F(Y)$ be the Fano surface of lines contained in a cubic threefold Y. In [14, Thm. 1] it is proven that there exists a connected component $\mathfrak{M}'_Y(v)\subset\mathfrak{M}_Y(v)$ consisting of μ-stable ACM bundles such that $\mathfrak{M}'_Y(v)\cong F(Y)$.

This can be obtained by using a slightly different approach. First of all, observe that the ideal sheaves of lines $\mathcal{I}_l\in\mathbf{T}_Y$, for all $l\subset Y$ and $F(Y)$ is the moduli space of these sheaves. By applying $\Theta[-1]$ (see Lemma 1.10), we get an exact sequence in $\mathbf{Coh}(Y)$

$$0\to F_l:=\Theta(\mathcal{I}_l)[-1]\to\mathcal{O}_Y\otimes_{\mathbb{C}}H^0(Y,\mathcal{I}_l(H))\to\mathcal{I}_l(H)\to 0. \tag{1.2.8}$$

In particular, all F_l are torsion-free sheaves with Chern character v. By (1.2.8) and Lemma 1.9, we deduce that F_l are all ACM bundles. Since they belong to $\mathbf{T}_Y$, we have $H^0(Y,F_l)=0$ and as they have rank 2, this shows that they are μ-stable. By construction, the Fano variety of lines is then a connected component of $\mathfrak{M}_Y(v)$.

By [14, Lem. 1], the connected component $\mathfrak{M}'_Y(v)$ can also be characterized as the component of $\mathfrak{M}_Y(v)$ consisting of μ-stable torsion-free sheaves G satisfying $H^0(Y,G)=0$ and $H^0(Y,G(H))\neq 0$. Also, by Lemma 1.6 and by [13, Thm. 4.1 & Prop. 4.2], all balanced μ-stable ACM bundles G with $\mathrm{Ext}^1(G,G)\cong\mathbb{C}^2$ are in $\mathfrak{M}'_Y(v)$.

Remark 1.12. Let us remark that the original proof in [14] of the result in Example 1.11 relies on the so called *Serre's construction* which we briefly recall it in a more general form (e.g. [4]). Let X be a smooth projective manifold of dimension at least 3 and let E be a rank r vector bundle on X which is spanned by its global sections. The dependency locus of $r-1$ general sections $s_1,\dots,s_{r-1}$ of E is a locally complete intersection subscheme V of codimension 2 in X. If $L=\det(E)$, then the twisted canonical bundle $K_V\otimes L^{-1}$ is generated by $r-1$ sections.

Conversely, let V a codimension 2 locally complete intersection subscheme of X and let L be a line bundle on X such that $H^2(X, L^{-1}) = 0$. If $K_V \otimes L^{-1}$ is generated by $r-1$ global sections, then V can be obtained as the dependency locus of $r-1$ sections of E.

This construction is pervasive in the literature and it has been extensively used in various works to produce examples of stable ACM bundles.

1.3. **Quadric fibrations.** The results of [36] on the structure of the derived category of coherent sheaves on a fibration in quadrics will be the basic tools to study the derived category of cubic threefolds and fourfolds (containing a plane). We briefly summarize them here.

Consider a smooth algebraic variety S and a vector bundle E of rank n on S. We consider the projectivization $q : \mathbb{P}_S(E) \to S$ of E on S endowed with the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_S(E)/S}(1)$. Given a line bundle L on S and an inclusion of vector bundles $\sigma : L \to \mathrm{Sym}^2 E^\vee$, we denote by $\alpha : X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_S(E)$ the zero locus of σ and by $\pi : X \to S$ the restriction of q to X. It is not difficult to prove that π is a flat quadric fibration of relative dimension $n-2$. The geometric picture can be summarized by the following diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[r, hook, "\alpha"] \arrow[dr, "\pi"'] & \mathbb{P}_S(E) \arrow[d, "q"] \\
& S.
\end{tikzcd}$$

The quadric fibration $\pi : X \to S$ carries a *sheaf* $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ *of Clifford algebras.* In fact, $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ is the relative sheafified version of the classical Clifford algebra associated to a quadric on a vector space (more details can be found in [36, Sect. 3]). As in the absolute case, $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ has an *even part* $\mathcal{B}_0$ whose description as an $\mathcal{O}_S$-module is as follows

$$\mathcal{B}_0 \cong \mathcal{O}_S \oplus (\wedge^2 E \otimes L) \oplus (\wedge^4 E \otimes L^2) \oplus \dots$$

The *odd part* $\mathcal{B}_1$ of $\mathcal{B}_\sigma$ is such that

$$\mathcal{B}_1 \cong E \oplus (\wedge^3 E \otimes L) \oplus (\wedge^5 E \otimes L^2) \oplus \dots$$

We also denote $\mathcal{B}_{2i} = \mathcal{B}_0 \otimes L^{-i}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{2i+1} = \mathcal{B}_1 \otimes L^{-i}$.

We write $\mathbf{Coh}(S, \mathcal{B}_0)$ for the abelian category of coherent $\mathcal{B}_0$-modules on S and $\mathrm{D^b}(S, \mathcal{B}_0)$ for its derived category.

Theorem 1.13 ([36, Thm. 4.2])**.** *If $\pi : X \to S$ is a quadric fibration as above, then there exists a semiorthogonal decomposition*

$$\mathrm{D^b}(X) = \langle \mathrm{D^b}(S, \mathcal{B}_0), \pi^*(\mathrm{D^b}(S)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{X/S}(1), \pi^*(\mathrm{D^b}(S)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{X/S}(2), \dots, \pi^*(\mathrm{D^b}(S)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{X/S}(n-2) \rangle,$$

where $\mathrm{D^b}(S, \mathcal{B}_0)$ is the derived category of coherent sheaves of $\mathcal{B}_0$-modules on S.

In order to make this result precise, we need to give the definition of the fully faithful functor $\mathrm{D^b}(S, \mathcal{B}_0) \to \mathrm{D^b}(X)$ providing the embedding in the above semiorthogonal decomposition. The exact functor $\Phi := \Phi_{\mathcal{E}'} : \mathrm{D^b}(S, \mathcal{B}_0) \to \mathrm{D^b}(X)$ is defined as the Fourier–Mukai transform

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{E}'}(-) := \pi^*(-) \otimes_{\pi^*\mathcal{B}_0} \mathcal{E}',$$

where $\mathcal{E}' \in \mathbf{Coh}(X)$ is a rank 2^{n-2} vector bundle on X with a natural structure of flat left $\pi^*\mathcal{B}_0$-module defined by the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow q^*\mathcal{B}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_S(E)/S}(-2) \longrightarrow q^*\mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_S(E)/S}(-1) \longrightarrow \alpha_*\mathcal{E}' \longrightarrow 0. \tag{1.3.1}$$

In the notation of [36, Lem. 4.5], $\mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E}'_{-1,1}$. The left adjoint functor of Φ is

$$\Psi(-) := \pi_*((-) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \det E^\vee[n-2]), \tag{1.3.2}$$

where $\mathcal{E} \in \mathbf{Coh}(X)$ is another rank 2^{n-2} vector bundle with a natural structure of right $\pi^*\mathcal{B}_0$-module (see again [36, Sect. 4]). The analogous presentation of $\mathcal{E}$ is

$$0 \longrightarrow q^*\mathcal{B}_{-1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_S(E)/S}(-2) \longrightarrow q^*\mathcal{B}_0 \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_S(E)/S}(-1) \longrightarrow \alpha_*\mathcal{E} \longrightarrow 0. \tag{1.3.3}$$

In the notation of [36, Lem. 4.5], $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_{-1,0}$.

The category of $\mathcal{B}_0$-modules may be hard to work with directly. In some cases, we can reduce to a category of modules over a sheaf of Azumaya algebras, which is easier to deal with. We conclude this section by recalling this interpretation (see [36, Sections 3.5 & 3.6]). We define $S_1 \subset S$ to be the degeneracy locus of π, namely the subscheme parameterizing singular quadrics, and $S_2 \subset S_1$ the locus of singular quadrics of corank $\geqslant 2$. We have to consider two separate cases, according to n being even or odd.

n even. Let $f : \widetilde{S} \to S$ be the double cover of S ramified at S_1.

Proposition 1.14. *There exists a sheaf of algebras $\mathcal{A}_0$ on $\widetilde{S}$ such that $f_*\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{B}_0$ and*

$$f_* : \mathbf{Coh}(\widetilde{S}, \mathcal{A}_0) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{Coh}(S, \mathcal{B}_0)$$

is an equivalence of categories. Moreover, the restriction of $\mathcal{A}_0$ to $\widetilde{S}_2 = f^{-1}(S_2)$ is a sheaf of Azumaya algebras.

This will be the case for cubic fourfolds containing a plane. If the cubic is generic, then S_1 is smooth and S_2 is empty.

n odd. Let $f : \widehat{S} \to S$ be the the stack of 2^{nd} roots of $\mathcal{O}_S(S_1)$ along the section S_1. An object of this stack over $T \to S$ is a triple (L, ϕ, δ), where L is a line bundle over T, ϕ is an isomorphism of L^2 with the pullback of $\mathcal{O}_S(S_1)$ to T and δ is a section of L such that $\phi(\delta^2) = S_1$ (see [3, 18]).

Proposition 1.15. *There exists a sheaf of algebras $\mathcal{A}_0$ on $\widehat{S}$ such that $f_*\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{B}_0$ and*

$$f_* : \mathbf{Coh}(\widehat{S}, \mathcal{A}_0) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{Coh}(S, \mathcal{B}_0)$$

is an equivalence of categories. Moreover, the restriction of $\mathcal{A}_0$ to $\widehat{S}_2 = f^{-1}(S_2)$ is a sheaf of Azumaya algebras.

This will be the case for any cubic threefold. In fact, since we assume from the beginning that a cubic threefold is smooth, then S_1 is smooth and S_2 is empty.

2. Cubic threefolds

This section contains the proofs of our main results on ACM bundles on cubic threefolds. The goal is to generalize a result of Casanellas–Hartshorne on Ulrich bundles.

As explained in the introduction, the idea is to use Kuznetsov's results on quadric fibrations, to reduce the problem of studying ACM bundles on a cubic threefold to the study of complexes of sheaves on $\mathbb{P}^2$ with the action of a sheaf of Clifford algebras $\mathcal{B}_0$.

The main technical parts are Sections 2.2 and 2.3; there we prove some results on moduli spaces of objects in $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$, which are stable with respect to a Bridgeland stability condition. We come back to Ulrich bundles on cubic threefolds in Section 2.5.

2.1. **The setting.** Let $Y \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a cubic threefold. Let $l_0 \subseteq Y$ be a general line and consider the blow-up $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$ of $\mathbb{P}^4$ along l_0. By "general" we mean that, if l is any other line meeting l_0, then the plane containing them intersects the cubic in three distinct lines (we just avoid the lines of second type, see [24, Def. 6.6]). We set $q : \widetilde{\mathbb{P}} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ to be the $\mathbb{P}^2$-bundle induced by the projection from l_0 onto a plane and we denote by $\widetilde{Y}$ the strict transform of Y via this blow-up. The restriction of q to $\widetilde{Y}$ induces a conic fibration $\pi : \widetilde{Y} \to \mathbb{P}^2$. The geometric picture can be summarized by the following diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
D \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d, "s"'] & \widetilde{Y} \arrow[r, hook, "\alpha"] \arrow[d, "\sigma"'] \arrow[drr, "\pi"] & & \widetilde{\mathbb{P}} = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^{\oplus 2} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-h)) \arrow[d, "q"] \\
l_0 \arrow[r, hook] & Y \subset \mathbb{P}^4 & & \mathbb{P}^2.
\end{tikzcd}$$

In particular, the vector bundle E on $S = \mathbb{P}^2$ introduced in Section 1.3 is now $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^{\oplus 2} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-h)$. Set $D \subset \widetilde{Y}$ to be the exceptional divisor of the blow-up $\sigma : \widetilde{Y} \to Y$. We denote by h both the class of a line in $\mathbb{P}^2$ and its pull-backs to $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$ and $\widetilde{Y}$. We call H both the class of a hyperplane in $\mathbb{P}^4$ and its pull-backs to Y, $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$, and $\widetilde{Y}$. We recall that $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(D) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H-h)$, the relative ample line bundle is $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}}(H)$, the relative canonical bundle is $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}}(h-3H)$, and the dualizing line bundle $\omega_{\widetilde{Y}}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h-H)$ (see, e.g., [35, Lem. 4.1]).

The sheaf of even (resp. odd) parts of the Clifford algebra corresponding to π, from Section 1.3, specializes in the case of cubic threefolds to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_0 &\cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-h) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-2h)^{\oplus 2} \\ \mathcal{B}_1 &\cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^{\oplus 2} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-h) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-2h), \end{aligned} \tag{2.1.1}$$

as sheaves of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}$-modules. The rank 2 vector bundles $\mathcal{E}'$ and $\mathcal{E}$ sit in the short exact sequences provided by (1.3.1) and (1.3.3) respectively, where $L = \mathcal{O}_Y(-h)$.

Following [35] and [13, Sect. 2.1], one can give a description of the full subcategory $\mathbf{T}_Y$ in the semiorthogonal decomposition (1.2.1) of $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(Y)$. Indeed, first consider the semiorthogonal decomposition of $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\widetilde{Y})$ in Theorem 1.13 and the one

$$\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\widetilde{Y}) = \langle \sigma^*(\mathbf{T}_Y), \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H), i_*\mathcal{O}_D, i_*\mathcal{O}_D(H) \rangle$$

obtained by thinking of $\widetilde{Y}$ as the blow-up of Y along l_0 and using the main result in [50]. Then one shows that

$$\mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)} \circ \Phi(\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)) = \langle \sigma^* \mathbf{T}_Y, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H) \rangle$$

and thus we get a fully faithful embedding

$$\Xi_3 := (\sigma_* \circ \mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)} \circ \Phi)^{-1} : \mathbf{T}_Y \to \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0). \tag{2.1.2}$$

Note that, in view of [13, Prop. 2.9(i)], $\Xi_3(\mathbf{T}_Y)$ is the right orthogonal of the category generated by $\mathcal{B}_1$ in $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$.

Remark 2.1. For all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(mh)) = 0$ (see, e.g., [13, Ex. 2.4]). Thus, if $F \in \mathbf{T}_Y$, then $\Xi_3(F) = \Psi(F)$.

2.2. **$\mathcal{B}_0$-modules and stability.** Our first goal is to study moduli spaces of stable $\mathcal{B}_0$-modules. In this section we present how the usual notion of stability extends to our more general situation.

Let $K(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0) := K(\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0))$ denote the Grothendieck group. For objects in $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ we can consider the Euler characteristic

$$\chi(-,-) := \sum_i (-1)^i \hom^i_{\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)}(-,-).$$

A class $[A] \in K(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ in the Grothendieck group is *numerically trivial* if $\chi([M],[A]) = 0$, for all $[M] \in K(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$. We define the *numerical Grothendieck group* $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ as the quotient of $K(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ by numerically trivial classes.

Given $K \in \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$, we define its Chern character as

$$\mathrm{ch}(K) := \mathrm{ch}(\mathrm{Forg}(K)) \in K(\mathbb{P}^2) \otimes \mathbb{Q} = H^*(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathbb{Q}) \cong \mathbb{Q}^{\oplus 3},$$

where $\mathrm{Forg} : \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0) \to \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2)$ is the functor forgetting the $\mathcal{B}_0$-action. By linearity the Chern character extends to $K(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$; it factors through $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$.

Remark 2.2. (i) By [13, Prop. 2.12] we have $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0) = \mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{B}_1] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{B}_0] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{B}_{-1}]$. The Chern characters $\mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{B}_{-1}) = (4, -7, \frac{15}{2})$, $\mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{B}_0) = (4, -5, \frac{9}{2})$, and $\mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{B}_1) = (4, -3, \frac{5}{2})$ are linearly independent. Hence, the Chern character induces a group homomorphism $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0) \to K(\mathbb{P}^2)$ that is an isomorphism over $\mathbb{Q}$.

(ii) If $l \subseteq Y$ is a line and $\mathcal{I}_l$ is its ideal sheaf, by [13, Ex. 2.11], we have

$$\begin{aligned} [\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l)] &= [\mathcal{B}_1] - [\mathcal{B}_0] \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0) \\ \mathrm{ch}(\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l)) &= (0, 2, -2). \end{aligned} \tag{2.2.1}$$

(iii) Note that $[\mathcal{B}_2] = [\mathcal{B}_{-1}] - 3[\mathcal{B}_0] + 3[\mathcal{B}_1]$ and $[\mathcal{B}_{-2}] = 3[\mathcal{B}_{-1}] - 3[\mathcal{B}_0] + [\mathcal{B}_1]$.

(iv) Given $[F] = x[\mathcal{B}_{-1}] + y[\mathcal{B}_0] + z[\mathcal{B}_1]$ or $\mathrm{ch}([F]) = (r, c_1, \mathrm{ch}_2)$, we can compute the Euler characteristic as a $\mathcal{B}_0$-module with the following formulas

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(F,F) &= x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + 3xy + 3yz + 6xz \\ &= -\frac{7}{64} r^2 - \frac{1}{4} c_1^2 + \frac{1}{2} r \,\mathrm{ch}_2 \,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2.2}$$

(v) Let $F \in K(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$, such that $\mathrm{ch}(F) = (0, 2d, z)$. Then

$$\chi(\mathcal{B}_1, F) = z + 2d \quad \text{and} \quad \chi(\mathcal{B}_0, F) = z + 3d. \tag{2.2.3}$$

We define the Hilbert polynomial of a $\mathcal{B}_0$-module G as the Hilbert polynomial of $\mathrm{Forg}(G)$ with respect to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(h)$. Then, the notion of Gieseker (semi)stability is defined in the usual way. Moduli spaces of semistable $\mathcal{B}_0$-modules have been constructed by Simpson in [52, Thm. 4.7].

We can also consider the slope stability for torsion-free sheaves in $\mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$. Indeed, we have two natural functions *rank* and *degree* on $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{rk} : \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0) \to \mathbb{Z}, \qquad & \mathrm{rk}(K) := \mathrm{rk}(\mathrm{Forg}(K)) \\ \deg : \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0) \to \mathbb{Z}, \qquad & \deg(K) := \mathrm{c}_1(\mathrm{Forg}(K)).\mathrm{c}_1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(h)). \end{aligned}$$

Given $K \in \mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ with $\mathrm{rk}(K) \neq 0$, we can define the slope $\mu(K) := \deg(K)/\mathrm{rk}(K)$ and the notion of μ-(semi)stability in the usual way. When we say that K is either torsion-free or torsion of dimension d, we always mean that $\mathrm{Forg}(K)$ has this property.

Remark 2.3. As the rank of $\mathcal{B}_0$ and $\mathcal{B}_1$ is 4, a consequence of [13, Lem. 2.13(i)] is that these two objects are μ-stable. Moreover, all morphisms $\mathcal{B}_0 \to \mathcal{B}_1$ are injective.

We will need to study stability for objects in $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ which are not necessarily sheaves. To this end, we briefly recall the concept of Bridgeland stability condition. For all details we refer to [17, 33].

Definition 2.4. A (numerical, full) *Bridgeland stability condition* on $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ consists of a pair $\sigma = (Z, \mathbf{A})$, where

- $Z : \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0) \to \mathbb{C}$,
- $\mathbf{A}$ is the heart of a bounded t-structure on $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$,

satisfying the following compatibilities:

(a) For all $0 \neq G \in \mathbf{A}$,

$$Z(G) \in \{z \in \mathbb{C}^* : z = |z| \exp(i\pi\phi),\ 0 < \phi \leqslant 1\};$$

(b) Harder–Narasimhan filtrations exist with respect to σ-stability, namely for any $0 \neq G \in \mathbf{A}$, there is a filtration in $\mathbf{A}$

$$0 = G_0 \subset G_1 \subset \ldots \subset G_N = G$$

such that $F_i := G_i/G_{i-1}$ is σ-semistable and $\phi(F_1) > \ldots > \phi(F_N)$.

(c) the *support property* holds, namely there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all σ-semistable $F \in \mathbf{A}$,

$$\|F\| \leqslant C \cdot |Z(F)|.$$

In the previous definition, we used the following notation: by (a), any $0 \neq G \in \mathbf{A}$ has a *phase* $\phi(G) := \frac{1}{\pi}\arg(Z(G)) \in (0, 1]$. The notion of σ-stability in (b) is then given with respect to the phase: $G \in \mathbf{A}$ is *σ-(semi)stable* if, for all subobjects $G' \subset G$ in $\mathbf{A}$, $\phi(G') < (\leqslant)\phi(G)$. Finally, we denoted by $\| - \|$ any norm in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0) \otimes \mathbb{R}$. The support property is necessary to deform stability conditions and for the existence of a well-behaved wall and chamber structure (this is [16, Sect. 9]; the general statement we need is [8, Prop. 3.3]).

We will only need a special family of stability conditions on $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$.

Definition 2.5. For $m \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} Z_m : \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \\ [F] &\longmapsto rm^2 - \frac{9r}{64} - \frac{c_1}{2} - \frac{\mathrm{ch}_2}{2} + m\sqrt{-1}(r + c_1), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathrm{ch}([F]) = (r, c_1, \mathrm{ch}_2)$.

By the explicit computations in Remark 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_m([\mathcal{B}_0]) &= 4m^2 - \frac{5}{16} - m\sqrt{-1} \\ Z_m([\mathcal{B}_1]) &= 4m^2 - \frac{5}{16} + m\sqrt{-1} \\ Z_m([\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l)]) &= 2m\sqrt{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2.4}$$

To define an abelian category which is the heart of a bounded t-structure on $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$, let $\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F} \subseteq \mathbf{Coh}(S, \beta)$ be the following two full additive subcategories: The non-trivial objects in $\mathbf{T}$ are the sheaves $A \in \mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ such that their torsion-free part has Harder–Narasimhan factors (with respect to μ-stability) of slope $\mu > -1$. A non-trivial twisted sheaf $A \in \mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ is an object in $\mathbf{F}$ if A is torsion-free and every μ-semistable Harder–Narasimhan factor of A has slope $\mu \leqslant -1$. It is easy to see that $(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F})$ is a torsion theory and following [16], we define the heart of the induced t-structure as the abelian category

$$\mathbf{A} := \left\{ A \in \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0) : \begin{array}{l} \bullet\ \mathcal{H}^i(A) = 0 \text{ for } i \notin \{-1, 0\}, \\ \bullet\ \mathcal{H}^{-1}(A) \in \mathbf{F}, \\ \bullet\ \mathcal{H}^0(A) \in \mathbf{T} \end{array} \right\}.$$

By Remarks 2.2 and 2.3, $\mathcal{B}_0[1], \mathcal{B}_1, \Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l) \in \mathbf{A}$.

Lemma 2.6. *The pair $\sigma_m := (Z_m, \mathbf{A})$ defines a stability condition in $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$, for all $m > \frac{1}{4}$.*

Proof. This follows exactly in the same way as in [16, Prop. 7.1 and Sect. 11] and [55, Prop. 3.13]. The only non-standard fact that we need is a Bogomolov–Gieseker inequality for torsion-free μ-stable sheaves. This can be deduced by Serre duality as follows: Let $A \in \mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ be a torsion-free μ-stable sheaf. Then, by [13, Lem. 2.16] and Serre duality (see, e.g., [13, Prop. 2.9]), we have $\hom^2(A, A) = \hom(A, A \otimes_{\mathcal{B}_0} \mathcal{B}_{-1}) = 0$. Hence, $\chi(A, A) = 1 - \hom^1(A, A) \leqslant 1$ gives the desired inequality.

By proceeding as in [55, Sect. 3], to prove the lemma we only have to show property (a) in the definition of stability condition. Let A be a torsion-free μ-stable sheaf. Assume further that $\mu(A) = -1$, and so $\mathrm{Im}(Z_m([A])) = 0$. By (2.2.2) and the fact that $r > 0$, we have

$$\mathrm{Re}(Z_m([A])) = rm^2 - \frac{9r}{64} - \frac{c_1}{2} - \frac{\mathrm{ch}_2}{2} = \frac{1}{r}\left(-\chi(A, A) + m^2 r^2 - \frac{1}{4}(r + c_1)^2\right).$$

We need to prove the inequality $\mathrm{Re}(Z_m([A])) > 0$, namely $-\chi(A, A) + m^2 r^2 > 0$. By [13, Lem. 2.13], $r \geqslant 4$, and so for all $m > \frac{1}{4}$, we have $\mathrm{Re}(Z_m([A])) > 0$, as we wanted. □

We also observe that all the arguments in [54] generalize to the non-commutative setting (see also [41, 42]). In particular, for all $m > \frac{1}{4}$, it makes sense to speak about moduli spaces of σ_m-semistable objects in $\mathbf{A}$ as Artin stacks (of finite-type over $\mathbb{C}$, if we fix the numerical class), and about moduli space of σ_m-stable objects as algebraic spaces.

Remark 2.7. As in [43, Lem. 5.5], the objects $\mathcal{B}_0[1]$ and $\mathcal{B}_1$ are σ_m-stable, for all $m > \frac{1}{4}$.

2.3. **Moduli spaces of stable $\mathcal{B}_0$-modules: general results.** By keeping in mind (2.2.1), we are interested in the following moduli spaces of Gieseker semistable sheaves in $(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$:

Definition 2.8. Let $d \geqslant 1$. We denote by $\mathfrak{M}_d$ the moduli space of semistable $\mathcal{B}_0$-modules with numerical class $d[\mathcal{B}_1] - d[\mathcal{B}_0]$, or equivalently, with Chern character $(0, 2d, -2d)$. We denote by $\mathfrak{M}_d^s \subseteq \mathfrak{M}_d$ the open subset of stable $\mathcal{B}_0$-modules.

Example 2.9. Let $C' \subset Y$ be a rational curve of degree d. Note that, using for example [53, Thm. 62], one can see that there exists a $2d$-dimensional family of smooth rational curves of degree d on Y. We can consider the following construction due to Kuznetsov [34, Lem. 4.6]. Set

$$F_d := \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(i_*\mathcal{O}_{C'}(d-1))[-1] = \ker\left(H^0(Y, i_*\mathcal{O}_{C'}(d-1)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}} i_*\mathcal{O}_{C'}(d-1)\right) \in \mathbf{T}_Y. \tag{2.3.1}$$

where $i : C' \hookrightarrow Y$. Then $\Xi_3(F_d) \in \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^\perp$. Suppose that $C' \cap l_0 = \emptyset$. Denote by j the composition $C' \hookrightarrow \widetilde{Y} \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathbb{P}^2$. We can assume that $C := j(C')$ is an irreducible nodal curve. Arguing as in [13, Ex. 2.4], we conclude that

$$\Xi_3(F_d) \cong j_*(\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{C'}(-1)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2h).$$

So $\mathrm{Forg}(\Xi_3(F_d))$ is a rank 2 vector bundle supported on C and $\Xi_3(F_d) \in \mathfrak{M}_d^s$.

Example 2.10. We can specialize the previous example to the case in which $C' \subset Y$ is a line l which does not intersect l_0, namely $d = 1$. In such a case, we have $F_d \cong I_l$ and

$$\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l) \cong j_*(\mathcal{E}|_l) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(h). \tag{2.3.2}$$

Moreover, we have an isomorphism as $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}$-modules

$$\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l) \cong \mathcal{O}_l \oplus \mathcal{O}_l(-h).$$

Indeed, by (2.2.1), the Chern character of $\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l)$ as $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}$-module is

$$\mathrm{ch}(\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l)) = (0, 2, -2)\,,$$

Therefore, $\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l) \cong \mathcal{O}_l(a) \oplus \mathcal{O}_l(-1-a)$, for $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$. Since, by [13, Lem. 4.8], we have

$$0 = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)}(\mathcal{B}_0(h), \Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l)) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}, \mathcal{O}_l(a-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_l(-2-a)),$$

we deduce that $a = 0$, as we wanted.

It is a standard fact that the assignment

$$\Upsilon : \mathfrak{M}_d \to |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(d)| \qquad\qquad G \mapsto \mathrm{supp}\,\mathrm{Forg}(G).$$

extends to a morphism which is well-defined everywhere. Theorem A becomes then the following statement:

Theorem 2.11. *The moduli space $\mathfrak{M}_d$ is irreducible and, for a general curve $C \in |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(d)|$, we have*

$$\Upsilon^{-1}(C) \cong \bigsqcup_{2^{4d}} JC,$$

where $JC = \{L \in \mathrm{Pic}\, C \,|\, L$ is algebraically equivalent to $\mathcal{O}_C\}$ is the Jacobian of C. Moreover, the stable locus $\mathfrak{M}_d^s$ is smooth of dimension $d^2 + 1$.

Before proceeding with the general proof which is carried out in the next section, we examine the easy case $d=1$:

Proposition 2.12. *The moduli space $\mathfrak{M}_1 = \mathfrak{M}_1^s$ is isomorphic to the Fano surface of lines $F(Y)$ blown-up at the line l_0. In particular, $\mathfrak{M}_1$ is smooth and irreducible.*

To prove Proposition 2.12, we use wall-crossing techniques from [7] for the family of Bridgeland stability conditions σ_m of Lemma 2.6. The precise result we need is the following lemma, whose proof is exactly the same as [43, Lem. 5.7].

Lemma 2.13. *Let $F \in \mathfrak{M}_1$.*

(i) *If $F \in \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^{\perp}$ then F is σ_m-stable for all $m > \frac{1}{4}$. Moreover, in this case $F \in \mathbf{A} \cap \Xi_3(\mathbf{T}_Y)$. By* [13, Thm. 4.1], *$F \cong \Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l)$, for some line $l \neq l_0$ in Y.*

(ii) *If $F \notin \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^{\perp}$, then F sits in a short exact sequence*

$$0 \to \mathcal{B}_0 \to \mathcal{B}_1 \to F \to 0, \tag{2.3.3}$$

and F becomes σ_m-semistable for $m = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}$ with Jordan–Hölder filtration

$$\mathcal{B}_1 \to F \to \mathcal{B}_0[1].$$

By [13, Example 2.11], the object $\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_{l_0})$ sits in the distinguished triangle

$$\mathcal{B}_0[1] \to \Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_{l_0}) \to \mathcal{B}_1,$$

which is the Harder–Narasimhan filtration of $\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_{l_0})$ for $m > m_0 := \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}$. Thus, all such extensions (2.3.3) get contracted to $\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_{l_0})$ which is indeed σ_m-stable for $m \in (m_0 - \varepsilon, m_0)$. The wall-crossing phenomenon described in [43, Sect. 5.2] carries over and this proves Proposition 2.12.

2.4. **Proof of Theorem 2.11.** The argument is divided into various steps.

Step 1: *Deformation theory.* For any $G \in \mathfrak{M}_d$, we have $\chi(G,G) = -d^2$. Hence, to prove that $\mathfrak{M}_d^s$ is smooth of dimension d^2+1 it is enough to show that, it is non-empty and

$$\mathrm{Hom}^2_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(G,G) = 0,$$

for any $G \in \mathfrak{M}_d$.

The fact that $\mathfrak{M}_d^s$ is non-empty follows from Example 2.9 or from the next step. The vanishing of $\mathrm{Hom}^2_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(G,G)$ follows directly from Serre duality and the fact that $\mathrm{ch}_2(G \otimes_{\mathcal{B}_0} \mathcal{B}_{-1}) < \mathrm{ch}_2(G)$.

Step 2: *Fibres of $\Upsilon : \mathfrak{M}_d \to |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(d)|$.* We claim that for a nodal curve $C \in |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(d)|$,

$$\Upsilon^{-1}(C) \cong \bigsqcup_{2^{4d}} \mathrm{Pic}^0 C.$$

Recall that the conic fibration π degenerates along a smooth quintic $\Delta \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. Hence, by Proposition 1.15, we can consider the stack $\widehat{\mathbb{P}^2}$ over $\mathbb{P}^2$ of 2nd roots of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\Delta)$ along the section Δ. We denote by $\psi : \widehat{\mathbb{P}^2} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ the natural projection. We then have an equivalence of abelian categories

$$\psi_* : \mathbf{Coh}(\widehat{\mathbb{P}^2}, \mathcal{A}_0) \to \mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0). \tag{2.4.1}$$

Given a curve $C \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ we can restrict this construction to $\psi : \widehat{C} \to C$ where $\widehat{C}$ is a twisted curve (stack of 2^{nd} roots of $(C, \Delta|_C)$). The restriction $\mathcal{A}_0|_{\widehat{C}}$ is a sheaf of (trivial) Azumaya algebras, i.e., there exist a vector bundle of rank 2, $E_{C,0} \in \mathbf{Coh}(\widehat{C})$, such that $\mathcal{A}_0|_{\widehat{C}} = \mathcal{E}nd(E_{C,0})$ and

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbf{Coh}(\widehat{C}) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathbf{Coh}(\widehat{C}, \mathcal{A}_0|_{\widehat{C}}) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathbf{Coh}(C, \mathcal{B}_0|_C) \\ G & \longmapsto & G \otimes E_{C,0}^{\vee} & \longmapsto & \psi_*(G \otimes E_{C,0}^{\vee}) \end{array}$$

is an equivalence of categories. In particular,

$$\mathcal{B}_0|_C = \psi_*(\mathcal{E}nd(E_{C,0})). \tag{2.4.2}$$

We will denote $\Delta|_C$ by $\sum_{i=1}^{5d} p_i$ (possibly non-distinct). Abusing notation we will denote by $\frac{1}{2}p_i$ the section in $\widehat{C}$ corresponding to the 2^{nd}-root of p_i. An invertible sheaf on $\widehat{C}$ is of the form $\psi^* L \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{5d} \frac{\lambda_i}{2} p_i\Big)$, where $L \in \operatorname{Pic}(C)$ and $\lambda_i \in \{0, 1\}$ (see [18, Cor. 3.1.2]).

Consider the following sequence

$$\psi_*(\mathcal{E}nd(E_{C,0})) \xrightarrow{f_1} \psi_*\Big(\mathcal{E}nd(E_{C,0}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{5d} \tfrac{1}{2}p_i\Big)\Big) \xrightarrow{f_2} \psi_*(\mathcal{E}nd(E_{C,0})) \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(d),$$

given by multiplication with the section of $\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{5d} \frac{1}{2}p_i\Big)$ (see [18, Cor. 3.1.3]) and taking ψ_*. By definition of $E_{C,0}$ (see (2.4.2)), the first term is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}_0|_C$ and the last one is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}_0(h)|_C$. Moreover, since $\widehat{C}$ is the stack of 2^{nd} roots of $(C, \Delta|_C)$, the factorization $f_2 \circ f_1$ of $\mathcal{B}_0|_C \to \mathcal{B}_0(h)|_C$ corresponds to the structure of even and odd part of the Clifford algebra and

$$\mathcal{B}_1|_C \cong \psi_*\Big(\mathcal{E}nd(E_{C,0}) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{5d} \tfrac{1}{2}p_i\Big)\Big). \tag{2.4.3}$$

Given any locally free sheaf E of rank 2 on $\widehat{C}$, we can consider it as the extension $0 \to L_1 \to E \to L_2 \to 0$ of L_1 and L_2, two invertible sheaves on $\widehat{C}$. Note that, after renumbering the points p_i and tensoring E by a line bundle, we can assume that

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}} \to E \to \psi^* M \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\Big(\tfrac{1}{2}p_1 + \ldots + \tfrac{1}{2}p_k\Big) \to 0, \tag{2.4.4}$$

for some $k \in \{0, \ldots 5d\}$.

Now we consider $E = E_{C,0}$ in an extension like (2.4.4) and we want to determine k. We have the following natural diagram of $\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}$-modules

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] \\
0 \arrow[r] & E_{C,0} \otimes \psi^* M^{-1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{-1}{2} p_i \Big) \arrow[r, "f_1"] \arrow[d] & E_{C,0} \otimes \psi^* M^{-1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\Big(\sum_{i=k+1}^{5d} \frac{1}{2} p_i \Big) \arrow[d] \\
0 \arrow[r] & E_{C,0} \otimes E_{C,0}^{\vee} \arrow[r, "f_2"] \arrow[d] & E_{C,0} \otimes E_{C,0}^{\vee} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{5d} \frac{1}{2} p_i \Big) \arrow[d] \\
0 \arrow[r] & E_{C,0} \arrow[r, "f_3"] \arrow[d] & E_{C,0} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{5d} \frac{1}{2} p_i \Big) \arrow[d] \\
 & 0 & 0,
\end{tikzcd} \tag{2.4.5}$$

where the horizontal injections f_i are given by multiplication with the section of $\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{5d} \frac{1}{2} p_i \Big)$ (see [18, Cor. 3.1.3]), and the vertical columns are the dual of (2.4.4) tensored with $E_{C,0}$.

By (2.4.2) and (2.4.3), note that $\psi_*(f_2)$ gives the following exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_0|_C \overset{\psi_*(f_2)}{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{B}_1|_C \longrightarrow \operatorname{coker} \psi_*(f_2) \longrightarrow 0, \tag{2.4.6}$$

Now, we want to compute $\operatorname{coker} \psi_*(f_1)$ and $\operatorname{coker} \psi_*(f_3)$.

Using again (2.4.4) with $E = E_{C,0}$, we have

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] \\
0 \arrow[r] & \psi^* M \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{2} p_i \Big) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \psi^*\Big(M \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(\sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i) \Big) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\Big(\sum_{i=k+1}^{5d} \frac{1}{2} p_i \Big) \arrow[d] \\
0 \arrow[r] & E_{C,0} \arrow[r, "f_3"] \arrow[d] & E_{C,0} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{5d} \frac{1}{2} p_i \Big) \arrow[d] \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{5d} \frac{1}{2} p_i \Big) \arrow[d] \\
 & 0 & 0,
\end{tikzcd}$$

By [18, Thm. 3.1.1], when we take ψ_* in the previous diagram we obtain the following exact diagram of $\mathcal{O}_C$-modules

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & & \\
0 \arrow[r] & M \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & M\otimes\mathcal{O}_C(\sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \bigoplus_{i=1}^{k}\mathbb{C}(p_i) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \psi_*E_{C,0} \arrow[r, "\psi_*(f_3)"] \arrow[d] & \psi_*\left(E_{C,0}\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{5d}\frac{1}{2}p_i\right)\right) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \operatorname{coker}\psi_*(f_3) \arrow[r] & 0 \\
 & \mathcal{O}_C \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{O}_C \arrow[d] & & \\
 & 0 & 0 & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

The same argument with f_1, gives that, as $\mathcal{O}_C$-modules,

$$\operatorname{coker}\psi_*(f_1)\cong\operatorname{coker}\psi_*(f_3)=\bigoplus_{i=1}^{k}\mathbb{C}(p_i).$$

Therefore, by (2.4.5), we have $0\to\mathcal{O}_{p_1}\oplus\ldots\oplus\mathcal{O}_{p_k}\to T\to\mathcal{O}_{p_1}\oplus\ldots\oplus\mathcal{O}_{p_k}\to 0$. As an $\mathcal{O}_C$-module, $\chi(C,\mathcal{B}_1)-\chi(C,\mathcal{B}_0)=2d$, so we have determined $k=d$. In particular,

$$0\to\psi^*M^{-1}\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\left(\tfrac{-1}{2}p_1+\ldots+\tfrac{-1}{2}p_d\right)\to E_{C,0}^{\vee}\to\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\to 0. \tag{2.4.7}$$

If C is irreducible, then we can assume that $\psi_*E_{C,0}^{\vee}\in\mathfrak{M}_d$, (we only need to get that $\operatorname{ch}_2(\psi_*E_{C,0}^{\vee})=-2d$ as an $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}$, which we achieve after tensoring $E_{C,0}$ by an element in $\operatorname{Pic}(\widehat{C})$). Hence, by (2.4.7), we get that

$$\psi_*\left(E_{C,0}^{\vee}\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\Big(\sum_{i=d+1}^{5d}\tfrac{\lambda_i}{2}p_i\Big)\right),\qquad\text{for }\lambda_i\in\{0,1\}\,, \tag{2.4.8}$$

are 2^{4d} distinct $\mathcal{B}_0|_C$-modules in $\mathfrak{M}_d$. If C is irreducible then

$$\varUpsilon^{-1}(C)\cong\bigsqcup_{2^{4d}}JC.$$

Step 3: $\mathfrak{M}_d$ *is irreducible.* To prove the irreducibility of $\mathfrak{M}_d$, we follow the same strategy as in [32]. We first prove that $\mathfrak{M}_d$ is connected by simply following the same argument as in the proof of [32, Thm. 4.4]. Indeed, by Proposition 2.12, we know that $\mathfrak{M}_1$ is connected. Now if $1\leqslant d_1\leqslant d_2<d$ and $d_1+d_2=d$, we have the natural maps $\varphi_{d_1,d_2}:\mathfrak{M}_{d_1}\times\mathfrak{M}_{d_2}\to\mathfrak{M}_d$ sending the pair (E_1,E_2) to $E_1\oplus E_2$. Their images coincide with the semistable locus of $\mathfrak{M}_d$, which is then connected by induction. The existence of a connected component in $\mathfrak{M}_d$ consisting of purely stable objects can be excluded by using an argument of Mukai as in the proof of [32, Thm. 4.1]. For the convenience of the reader, let us outline here some details.

The aim is to show that, if there exists a connected component Y of the moduli space $\mathfrak{M}_d$ consisting only of stable sheaves, then $Y \cong \mathfrak{M}_d$. Take a point $F \in Y$ and assume there is $G \in \mathfrak{M}_d \setminus Y$. The arguments in [32, Lemma 4.2] and in [32, §4.3] show that we can essentially assume that there is a universal family $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbf{Coh}(Y \times \mathfrak{M}_d)$ with two projections $p : Y \times \mathfrak{M}_d \to Y$ and $q : Y \times \mathfrak{M}_d \to \mathfrak{M}_d$. By the same argument as in Step 1, we have that $\mathrm{Hom}^2_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(G', F') = 0$, for all $G', F' \in \mathfrak{M}_d$. Hence a computation of local Exts shows that

$$\mathrm{Ext}^0_p(q^*G, \mathcal{F}) = \mathrm{Ext}^2_p(q^*G, \mathcal{F}) = 0,$$

while $\mathrm{Ext}^1_p(q^*G, \mathcal{F})$ is locally free of rank $d^2 < 1 + d^2 = \dim(Y)$ (the last equality follows again from Step 1). If we replace G by F, we get a complex of $\mathcal{O}_Y$-modules

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] & A_0 \arrow[r, "\alpha"] & A_1 \arrow[r, "\beta"] & A_2 \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd} \tag{2.4.9}$$

such that $H^i(A^\bullet) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^i_p(q^*F, \mathcal{F})$ (more generally, this holds for any base change $S \to Y$).

It turns out that the point $F \in Y$ is the degeneracy locus of the map α (see [32, Lemma 4.3]). Thus, blowing up Y at F, we get $f : Z \to Y$ providing, as in (2.4.9), a new complex of $\mathcal{O}_Z$-mudules

$$\begin{tikzcd} A'_0 \arrow[r, "\alpha'"] & A'_1 \arrow[r, "\beta'"] & A'_2 \end{tikzcd}$$

with an inclusion $f^*A_0 \subseteq A'_0$. Let D be the exceptional divisor in Z and let W' be the middle cohomology of

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] & A'_0 \arrow[r] & f^*A_1 \arrow[r] & A'_2 \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

If $M := A'_0/f^*A_0$, then, by the same computations of the Chern classes as in [32, §4.4], we get $c(W') = f^*c(W) \cdot c(-M)$. As the rank of W and W' are smaller than $\dim(Y)$, one gets a contradiction as $c_{\dim(Y)}(W') = 0$ while, using that $M \cong \mathcal{O}_D(D)$, one shows that the component in degree $\dim(Y)$ of $f^*c(W) \cdot c(-M)$ is not trivial.

Hence, to conclude that $\mathfrak{M}_d$ is irreducible, it is enough to show that it is normal. Since $\mathrm{Hom}^2_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(G, G) = 0$ for all $G \in \mathfrak{M}_d$, the Kuranishi map is trivial. Following then the notation of [32, §2.7], the quadratic part μ of the Kuranishi map is also trivial and the null-fibre $F = \mu^{-1}(0)$ coincides with $\mathrm{Hom}^1_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(G, G)$, which is obviously normal. Then we can apply [32, Prop. 3.8], i.e., if we consider a slice S of an orbit of a semistable point $[q]$ of the corresponding Quot-space, we have that $\mathcal{O}_{S,[q]}$ is a normal domain. Since being normal is an open property, we can use the arguments of the proof of [32, Prop. 3.11] to prove that the locus R^{ss} of semistable points of the Quot-space is normal. A GIT-quotient of a normal scheme is normal, so $\mathfrak{M}_d$ is, since it is a GIT-quotient of R^{ss}.

This finally concludes the proof of Theorem 2.11.

Remark 2.14. When $d = 1$, the map Υ has a very natural and well-known geometrical interpretation. In fact, given a $\mathcal{B}_0$-module F supported on a general line $l \subset \mathbb{P}^2$, we can consider all the lines l' in Y such that $\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_{l'}) \cong F$. By Proposition 2.12, we have to count the number of lines l' that map to l via the projection from l_0 (where the lines that intersect l_0 are mapped to the projection of the tangent space of the intersection point). The lines that intersect l_0 form an Abel–Prym curve in $F(Y)$, so they do not dominate $|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1)|$. Hence, we need only to count the skew lines to l_0 that map to l. The preimage of l via the projection is a cubic surface, so it contains 27 lines.

The line l intersects the degeneration quintic Δ in 5 points, which give us 5 coplanar pairs of lines intersecting l_0. Hence we have $27-10-1=2^4$ lines skew from l_0 that project to l. Indeed, if $\mathrm{Bl}_{l_0} F(Y)$ is the blow-up of $F(Y)$ along l_0, we have a finite morphism $\mathrm{Bl}_{l_0} F(Y) \to |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1)|$ which is $2^4:1$ (see, e.g., [10, Proof of Thm. 4]).

For applications to stable sheaves on cubic threefolds, as in Lemma 2.13, we consider the subset

$$\mathfrak{N}_d := \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^{\perp} \cap \mathfrak{M}_d.$$

Proposition 2.15. *The subset* $\mathfrak{N}_d$ *is open and dense in* $\mathfrak{M}_d$*.*

Proof. We follow the notation of the previous proof, and we denote by $E_{C,0} \in \mathbf{Coh}(\widehat{C})$ the vector bundle of rank 2, such that

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbf{Coh}(\widehat{C}) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathbf{Coh}(\widehat{C}, \mathcal{A}_0|_{\widehat{C}}) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathbf{Coh}(C, \mathcal{B}_0|_C) \\ G & \longmapsto & G \otimes E_{C,0}^{\vee} & \longmapsto & \psi_*(G \otimes E_{C,0}^{\vee}) \end{array}$$

is an equivalence of categories and $\psi_* E_{C,0}^{\vee} \in \mathfrak{M}_d$.

We denote by $E_{C,1} \in \mathbf{Coh}(\widehat{C})$ the rank 2 vector bundle such that $\psi_*(E_{C,1} \otimes E_{C,0}^{\vee}) = \mathcal{B}_1|_C$. From the previous proof it follows that $E_{C,1} \cong E_{C,0} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{C}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{5d} \frac{1}{2} p_i\right)$ (see (2.4.3)). Let $F \in \mathfrak{M}_d$. Recall that $\chi(\mathcal{B}_1, F) = 0$ (see (2.2.3)). Hence $\mathrm{Hom}^1_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)}(\mathcal{B}_1, F) = \mathrm{Hom}^0_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)}(\mathcal{B}_1, F)$. Since $\Xi_3(F_d) \in \mathfrak{M}_d \cap \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^{\perp}$ (see Example 2.9), we have that

$$\Theta_{E_{C,1}} = \left\{ L \in \Upsilon^{-1}(C) \,\middle|\, L \otimes E_{C,1} \text{ has sections} \right\}$$

is a proper subset. More precisely, by [18, Cor. 3.1.2], $\Upsilon^{-1}(C) \setminus \Theta_{E_{C,1}}$ is an open dense subset in $\Upsilon^{-1}(C)$ (in each component JC is the complementary of a divisor). By semicontinuity, over a general curve $C \in |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(d)|$, $\Upsilon^{-1}(C) \cap \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^{\perp}$ is an open dense subset in $\Upsilon^{-1}(C)$. ☐

2.5. **Ulrich bundles.** We now apply the results on $\mathcal{B}_0$-modules of the previous section to study Ulrich bundles on a cubic threefold Y. The goal is to prove Theorem B from the introduction.

Definition 2.16. An ACM bundle F on Y is called *Ulrich* if the graded module $H^0_*(Y, F) := \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} H^0(Y, F(mH))$ has $3\,\mathrm{rk}(F)$ generators in degree 1.

We refer to [21, Sect. 1] for the basic properties of Ulrich bundles on projective varieties. In particular, we recall the following presentation of stable Ulrich bundles due to the Harthsorne–Serre construction

Lemma 2.17. *A stable Ulrich bundle* F *of rank* r *on a cubic threefold* Y *admits the following presentation*

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_Y(-H)^{\oplus r-1} \to F \to \mathcal{I}_C \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y((r-1)H) \to 0, \tag{2.5.1}$$

where C *is a smooth connected curve of degree* $\frac{3r^2-r}{2}$ *and arithmetic genus* $r^3 - 2r^2 + 1$*.*

Proof. By definition, $F(H)$ is generated by global sections, so $G := \mathrm{coker}(\mathcal{O}_Y(-H)^{\oplus r-1} \hookrightarrow F)$ is a torsion-free sheaf of rank 1. By choosing the sections appropiately, we get that $G = \mathcal{I}_C \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(sH)$, where $C \subset Y$ is a smooth curve. By [21, Lem. 2.4(iii)], we have $c_1(F(H)) = r$, so $s = r-1$. Since $h^1(Y, \mathcal{I}_C) = 0$, C is connected. By [20, Prop. 3.7], we have that $\deg C = \frac{3r^2-r}{2}$ and by Riemann–Roch we get $p_a(C) = r^3 - 2r^2 + 1$. ☐

From Lemma 2.17 it is standard to compute the Chern character of an Ulrich bundle F of rank r, by using Hirzebruch–Riemann–Roch:

$$\mathrm{ch}(F) = (r, 0, -r \cdot l, 0), \tag{2.5.2}$$

where l denotes the class of a line in Y.

Remark 2.18. Notice that, in their definition of Ulrich bundles [21, Def. 2.1], Casanellas and Hartshorne impose the generators to be in degree 0. Hence, their Ulrich bundles can be obtained from ours by twisting by $\mathcal{O}_Y(H)$ and viceversa. We prefer this normalization, since then Ulrich bundles are *balanced* ACM bundles (recall Definition 1.5). Moreover, with this normalization, instanton bundles of minimal charge (see the forthcoming Definition 3.6 and the subsequent comments) are also Ulrich bundles.

Denote by $\mathfrak{M}_r^{sU}$ the moduli space of stable Ulrich bundles of rank $r \geqslant 2$. It is smooth of dimension r^2+1 since for any such bundle E, we have $\dim \mathrm{Ext}^1(E,E) = r^2+1$ while $\dim \mathrm{Ext}^2(E,E) = 0$.

To prove that $\mathfrak{M}_r^{sU}$ is non-empty, the strategy is to show the existence of low rank Ulrich bundles ($r = 2, 3$) and then use a "standard" deformation argument [21, Thm. 5.7]. The existence of rank 2 Ulrich bundles is well-known [25, 46]. They usually appear in the literature as instanton bundles (see the forthcoming Section 3). In [21] the authors construct rank 3 Ulrich bundles, relying on the existence of an ACM curve on Y of degree 12 and genus 10 (see Lemma 2.17). The existence of such curves is proved, using `Macaulay2`, by Geiß and Schreyer in the appendix and only for a generic cubic threefold.

Our approach to construct Ulrich bundles of rank 3 is different (for completeness we also construct rank 2 Ulrich bundles). In particular, we do not use the Hartshorne–Serre construction (see Lemma 2.17), but the structure of conic fibration of a blow-up of Y. We have computed the image in $\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ of the ideal sheaves of lines in Y in Example 2.10. We can therefore consider extensions of them, and use deformation theory to cover the open set $\mathfrak{N}_d \subset \mathfrak{M}_d$ (for $d = 2, 3$). If G is a general sheaf in $\mathfrak{N}_d$, then the object $\Xi_3^{-1}(G)$ will be a stable ACM bundle of rank d, which will be automatically Ulrich.

The advantage of our approach is that by using the category $\mathbf{T}_Y$ we are able to reduce all computations to the category $\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$, via the functor Ξ_3. Thus, the existence result needed goes back to Theorem 2.11.

Given $G \in \mathfrak{N}_d$, we want to study $\Xi_3^{-1}(G) \in \mathbf{T}_Y$. In order to show that it is an ACM bundle we want to see how the vanishings in Lemma 1.9 can be checked in $\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$.

Lemma 2.19. *We have the following natural isomorphisms*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(Y)}(\mathcal{O}_Y(2H), F)[2] &\cong \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2h) \otimes \mathcal{B}_0, \Xi_3(F)) \\
&\cong \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2)}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2h), \Xi_3(F)), \\
\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(Y)}(\mathcal{O}_Y(-H), F) &\cong \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(\mathcal{B}_{-1}, \Xi_3(F)) \\
&\cong \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2)}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}, \mathrm{Forg}(\Xi_3(F \otimes_{\mathcal{B}_0} \mathcal{B}_1))),
\end{aligned}$$

for all $F \in \mathbf{T}_Y$.

Proof. As for the first series of isomorphisms, we start with the following chain of natural isomorphisms, which follows directly from the definitions:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(Y)}(\mathcal{O}_Y(2H),F) &\cong \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(Y)}(\mathcal{O}_Y(2H),\Xi_3^{-1}(\Xi_3(F)))\\ &\cong \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(Y)}(\mathcal{O}_Y(2H),\sigma_*\circ\mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)}\circ\Phi\circ\Xi_3(F))\\ &\cong \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(\Psi\circ\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H)}(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H)),\Xi_3(F)).\end{aligned}\tag{2.5.3}$$

By (1.1.1), $\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H)}\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H)$ is given by

$$\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H)}\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H)=\mathrm{cone}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H)^{\oplus 5}\xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}}\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H)\right).\tag{2.5.4}$$

By definition of Ψ (1.3.2), we have the two exact triangles in $\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)$:

$$\begin{gathered}\mathcal{B}_1[1]\to\mathcal{B}_0(h)\otimes q_*\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^4}(H)[1]\to\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H))\\ \mathcal{B}_1\otimes q_*\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^4}(-H)[1]\to\mathcal{B}_0(h)[1]\to\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H)).\end{gathered}$$

Since $\Xi_3(F)\in\langle\mathcal{B}_1\rangle^{\perp}$ and $q_*\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^4}(H)=\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^{\oplus 2}\oplus\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(h)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H)),\Xi_3(F)) &= \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(\mathcal{B}_0(h)\otimes q_*\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^4}(H)[1],\Xi_3(F))\\ &= \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(\mathcal{B}_0\otimes(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(h)^{\oplus 2}\oplus\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2h))[1],\Xi_3(F)).\end{aligned}$$

and since $q_*\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^4}(-H)=0$,

$$\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(\Psi\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H),\Xi_3F)=\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(\mathcal{B}_0(h)[1],\Xi_3(F)).$$

Therefore, combining (2.5.3) and (2.5.4) we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(Y)}(\mathcal{O}_Y(2H),F)\cong\\ &\qquad\cong\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}\left(\mathcal{B}_0\otimes\mathrm{cone}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(h)^{\oplus 5}\xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}}\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(h)^{\oplus 2}\oplus\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2h))[1],\Xi_3(F)\right)\\ &\qquad\cong\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}\left(\mathcal{B}_0\otimes\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2h),\Xi_3(F)\right)[-2]\\ &\qquad\cong\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2)}\left(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2h),\Xi_3(F)\right)[-2],\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\mathrm{cone}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(h)^{\oplus 5}\xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}}\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(h)^{\oplus 2}\oplus\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2h))\cong\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2h)[1]$, and the first row of isomorphisms follows.

It remains to prove the isomorphisms in the second line of the lemma. We start with the following chain of natural isomorphisms, which follows directly from the definitions:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(Y)}(\mathcal{O}_Y(-H),F) &\cong \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(Y)}(\mathcal{O}_Y(-H),\Xi_3^{-1}(\Xi_3(F)))\\ &\cong \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(Y)}(\mathcal{O}_Y(-H),\sigma_*\circ\mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)}\circ\Phi\circ\Xi_3(F))\\ &\cong \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(\Psi\circ\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H)}(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-H)),\Xi_3(F))\\ &\cong \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-H)),\Xi_3(F))\\ &\cong \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(\mathcal{B}_{-1},\Xi_3(F)).\end{aligned}\tag{2.5.5}$$

The last isomorphism is an easy computation, and the lemma follows. □

Now we are ready to give a geometric interpretation of the objects of $\mathfrak{N}_d$ (recall (2.4)).

Proposition 2.20. *If $d=2,3$ and G is a general sheaf in $\mathfrak{N}_d$, then the object $\Xi_3^{-1}(G)$ is a stable ACM bundle of rank d.*

Proof. Again the argument can be divided in a few parts.

Step 1: $\Xi_3^{-1}G$ *is a coherent sheaf.* By Example 2.9, the sheaf F_d is in $\mathbf{T}_Y$ and $\Xi_3(F_d)\in\mathfrak{N}_d$. By semi-continuity, for $G\in\mathfrak{N}_d$ general, the object $\Xi_3^{-1}(G)$ has to be a sheaf.

Step 2: *First vanishing.* We want to show that $H^i(Y,\Xi_3^{-1}(G)\otimes\mathcal{O}_Y(-2H))=0$ for $i=1,2$. By Lemma 2.19, we need to prove that $\mathrm{Hom}^0_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2)}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2h),G)=0$.

Before that, by Example 2.10, we observe that

$$\mathrm{Hom}^0_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(\mathcal{B}_0,\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l))=\mathrm{Hom}^0_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2},\mathcal{O}_l\oplus\mathcal{O}_l(-1))\cong\mathbb{C},$$

and all other Hom-groups are trivial. The extension of d sheaves $\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l)$ (with different l) lies in $\mathfrak{M}^s_d$. By semicontinuity and induction on d,

$$\mathrm{Hom}^0_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(\mathcal{B}_0,G)\cong H^0(\mathbb{P}^2,G)\cong\mathbb{C}^d, \tag{2.5.6}$$

for G general $\mathfrak{M}_d$.

Case 1: *Rank* $d=2$. Let G be supported in $j_C:\mathbb{P}^1\hookrightarrow C\in|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2)|$. Let C be smooth and intersecting Δ transversally. Note that $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2h)|_C\cong i_*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)^{\oplus 2})$, so we have to show that $H^0(\mathbb{P}^1,G(-1))=0$. By (2.5.6) and semi-continuity, G has only two possibilities (as $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}$-module):

$$G\cong j_{C_*}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)\oplus\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1)\right), \tag{2.5.7}$$

$$G\cong\mathcal{O}_C^{\oplus 2}. \tag{2.5.8}$$

If we are in situation (2.5.8), then the desired vanishing holds.

Assume now that $G\cong j_{C_*}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)\oplus\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1))$. Recall that $G=\psi_*(L\otimes E^\vee_{C,0})$ for some $L\in\mathrm{Pic}\,\widehat{C}$. We use a method from [11, 30]. The projective bundle $\mathbb{P}(L\otimes E^\vee_{C,0})\to\widehat{C}$ corresponds by definition to the conic bundle over $\widehat{C}$ induced by the conic fibration $\pi:\widetilde{Y}\to\mathbb{P}^2$. More precisely, $\pi^{-1}(C)$ is a conic bundle over C with 10 singular fibres $\pi^{-1}(C\cap\Delta)=\bigcup_{i=1}^{10}l_i\cup l'_i$. The lines l_i and l'_i are (-1)-curves. Then, we have

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbb{P}(L\otimes E^\vee_{C,0}) \arrow[r, "\psi'"] \arrow[d] & \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Forg}(\psi_*(L\otimes E^\vee_{C,0}))) =: S_C \arrow[d] \\
\widehat{C} \arrow[r, "\psi"] & C,
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the map ψ', factors through $\pi^{-1}(C)\to\mathbb{P}(\psi_*(L\otimes E^\vee_{C,0}))$ that corresponds to the blow-down of 10 (-1)-curves, say l_i for $i=1,\dots 10$. The fact that $\mathrm{Forg}(\psi_*(L\otimes E^\vee_{C,0}))=j_{C_*}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)\oplus\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1))$ implies that $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Forg}(\psi_*(L\otimes E^\vee_{C,0})))$ is isomorphic to the 2nd Hirzebruch surface, so we have a section c of $\pi^{-1}(C)\to C$, such that $c^2=-2$. Recall that the canonical bundle of $\widetilde{Y}$ is $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-H-h)=\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-D-S_C)$, where D is the exceptional divisor. The adjunction formula gives $K_{S_C}\equiv -\,D|_{S_C}$. By the adjunction formula $c^2=-2$, implies that $D\cdot c=0$. Hence, we can see c as a rational curve in Y of degree 2. The space of conics in Y is four dimensional, but by Theorem 2.11, $\mathfrak{M}_2$ has dimension 5.

Case 2: *Rank* $d = 3$. Let G be supported in $C \in |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(3)|$. Let C be smooth and intersect Δ transversally. Note that $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2h)|_C = F$ is an Atiyah bundle of degree 3, so we have to show that $H^0(C, G \otimes F^\vee) = 0$. By (2.5.6) and semi-continuity, G has only three possibilities (as $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}$-module):

$$G \cong \text{ Atiyah bundle of degree 3}, \tag{2.5.9}$$

$$G \cong (j_C)_*(\mathcal{L}_1 \oplus \mathcal{L}_2), \tag{2.5.10}$$

$$G \cong (j_C)_*(\mathcal{L}_0 \oplus \mathcal{L}_3), \tag{2.5.11}$$

where j_C denotes the embedding and $\mathcal{L}_i$ are generic line bundles of degree i on C.

If we are in situation (2.5.9), then the desired vanishing holds.

As before, assume for a contradiction, that (2.5.10) holds. The fact that $\mathrm{Forg}(\psi_*(L \otimes E_{C,0}^\vee)) = (j_C)_*(\mathcal{L}_1 \oplus \mathcal{L}_2)$ implies that $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Forg}(\psi_*(L \otimes E_{C,0}^\vee))) \to C$ has a section c of $\pi^{-1}(C) \to C$, such that $c^2 = -1$. Recall that the canonical bundle of $\widetilde{Y}$ is $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-H - h) = \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-D + h - S_C)$, where D is the exceptional divisor. The adjunction formula gives $K_{S_C} \equiv (-D + h)|_{S_C}$. By the adjunction formula $c^2 = -1$, implies that $D \cdot c = h \cdot c - 1 = 2$. Hence, we can see c as an elliptic quintic curve in Y meeting the projection line l_0 in 2 points. The space of elliptic quintic curves in Y is 10 dimensional [46, Thm. 4.5], so the one meeting l_0 in 2 points form an 8 dimensional family [46, Lem. 4.6], but $\mathfrak{M}_3$ has dimension 10 (by Theorem 2.11).

It remains to consider the last case (2.5.11). The fact that $\mathrm{Forg}(\psi_*(L \otimes E_{C,0}^\vee)) \cong (j_C)_*(\mathcal{L}_0 \oplus \mathcal{L}_3)$ implies that $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Forg}(\psi_*(L \otimes E_{C,0}^\vee))) \to C$ has a section c of $\pi^{-1}(C) \to C$, such that $c^2 = -3$. Recall that the canonical bundle of $\widetilde{Y}$ is $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-H - h) = \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-D + h - S_C)$, where D is the exceptional divisor. The adjunction formula gives $K_{S_C} \equiv (-D + h)|_{S_C}$. By the adjunction formula $c^2 = -3$, implies that $D \cdot c = h \cdot c - 3 = 0$. Hence, we can see c as an elliptic curve in Y of degree 3 (hence plane). The space of plane cubics in Y is nine dimensional, but by Theorem 2.11, $\mathfrak{M}_3$ has dimension 10.

Step 3: *Second vanishing and stability.* We want to show that $H^1(Y, \Xi_3^{-1}(G) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Y(H)) = 0$. By the second part of Lemma 2.19, we need to prove that $H^1(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathrm{Forg}(G \otimes_{\mathcal{B}_0} \mathcal{B}_1)) = 0$. Again we can argue as in Step 1 by semi-continuity and use that $G = \Xi_3(F_d)$ satisfies the vanishing. Thus $\Xi_3^{-1}(G)$ is an ACM bundle. As observed in [21, Sect. 5], $\Xi_3^{-1}(G)$ is stable since there are no Ulrich bundles of rank 1 on a cubic threefold. □

Note that the sheaves $\Xi_3^{-1}(G)$ in Proposition 2.20 are Ulrich. Since they lie in $\mathbf{T}_Y$, the same argument of [21, Lem. 2.4] shows that their restriction to a generic hyperplane section is again Ulrich.

To complete the non-emptiness statement of Theorem B, we should prove that there are stable Ulrich bundles for all ranks $r \geqslant 4$. For this we can use the same deformation argument as in the proof of [21, Thm. 5.7].

Remark 2.21. Note that, we have also reproven that $\mathfrak{M}_r^{sU}$ is smooth of dimension r^2+1. Indeed, the computations $\dim \mathrm{Ext}^1(F, F) = r^2 + 1$ and $\dim \mathrm{Ext}^2(F, F) = 0$ have already been done in Step 1 of Theorem 2.11.

3. THE $d = 2$ CASE AND THE INSTANTON BUNDLES ON CUBIC THREEFOLDS

In this section we will describe the wall-crossing phenomena that links the space $\mathfrak{M}_2$ to the moduli space of semistable instanton sheaves on Y. As in Section 2.2, the approach follows closely the discussion in [43, Sect. 5], but since the corresponding numerical class is not primitive, we need some extra arguments.

3.1. **Stability.** We consider the stability function Z_m (see Definition 2.5) and the (Bridgeland) stability condition $\sigma_m = (Z_m, \mathbf{A})$ (see Lemma 2.6).

A (semi)stable $\mathcal{B}_0$-module $F \in \mathfrak{M}_2$, remains σ_m-(semi)stable for all $m > m_0 = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}$. More precisely we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let* $F \in \mathfrak{M}_2$.

(a) *If* $m > m_0 = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}$, *then* F *is* σ_m*-stable or* F *is the extension of two* σ_m*-stable coherent* $\mathcal{B}_0$*-modules of class* $[\mathcal{B}_1] - [\mathcal{B}_0]$ *(so properly* σ_m*-semistable).*

(b) *If* $F \in \mathfrak{N}_2$ *and* F *is stable, then* F *is* σ_m*-stable for all* $m > \frac{1}{4}$. *If* F *is properly semistable, then* F *is the extension of two* σ_m*-stable coherent* $\mathcal{B}_0$*-modules of class* $[\mathcal{B}_1] - [\mathcal{B}_0]$ *for all* $m > \frac{1}{4}$.

(c) *Assume* $m = m_0$. *Then* F *is* σ_m*-semistable and falls in one of the following cases:*
   (c.i) $F \in \mathfrak{N}_2$ *is* σ_{m_0}*-stable.*
   (c.ii) $F \in \mathfrak{N}_2$ *is properly* σ_{m_0}*-semistable and its JH-factors are two* σ_{m_0}*-stable coherent* $\mathcal{B}_0$*-modules of class* $[\mathcal{B}_1] - [\mathcal{B}_0]$.
   (c.iii) $F \in \mathfrak{M}_2 \setminus \mathfrak{N}_2$ *and* F *is properly* σ_{m_0}*-semistable and its JH-factors are* $\mathcal{B}_0[1]$, $\mathcal{B}_1$ *and a coherent* $\mathcal{B}_0$*-module of class* $[\mathcal{B}_1] - [\mathcal{B}_0]$.
   (c.iv) $F \in \mathfrak{M}_2 \setminus \mathfrak{N}_2$ *and* F *is properly* σ_{m_0}*-semistable and its JH-factors are twice* $\mathcal{B}_0[1]$ *and twice* $\mathcal{B}_1$.

Proof. Suppose that $0 \to A \to F \to B \to 0$ destabilizes F, where A is σ_m-stable. We have

$$0 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(B) \to A \to F \to \mathcal{H}^0(B) \to 0$$

and $\operatorname{Im} Z_m([F]) = 4m$. Note that $J_m := \operatorname{Im} Z_m$ is an additive function in $K(\mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0))$ that takes values in $m\mathbb{Z}$. Thus, by definition, $-J_m(\mathcal{H}^{-1}(B))$, $J_m(\mathcal{H}^0(B))$, $J_m(A)$ take values in $\{0, m, 2m, 3m, 4m\}$.

Since $\mathcal{H}^0(B)$ is torsion, is either supported on points (and so $J_m(\mathcal{H}^0(B)) = 0$) or supported on a curve. By [13, Lem. 2.13], if it is supported on a curve, then $J_m(\mathcal{H}^0(B)) \in \{2m, 4m\}$. We cannot have $J_m(\mathcal{H}^0(B)) = 4m$ because then both $J_m(A)$ and $J_m(\mathcal{H}^{-1}(B))$ would be zero, which implies that $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(B) = 0$ and A is supported on points, which is impossible.

Hence, we have only two possibilities for $J_m(\mathcal{H}^0(B))$. Let $\operatorname{ch}([A]) = (r, c_1, \operatorname{ch}_2)$. Suppose first that $J_m(\mathcal{H}^0(B)) = 2m$. In that case, $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(B) = 0$. Since $c_1 + r = 2$ and A is torsion, then $c_1 = 2$. If $\operatorname{Re}(Z_m([A])) = rm^2 - \dfrac{9r}{64} - \dfrac{c_1}{2} - \dfrac{\operatorname{ch}_2}{2} \leqslant 0$, then $\operatorname{ch}_2 \geqslant -2$. In order to destabilize F, we need $\operatorname{ch}_2 = -2$ and F is a properly σ_m-semistable object whose JH-factors have class $[\mathcal{B}_1] - [\mathcal{B}_0]$.

Suppose now that $J_m(\mathcal{H}^0(B)) = 0$, so $\mathcal{H}^0(B)$ is supported on points. Clearly $J_m(A) > 0$ since A cannot be supported on points. If $J_m(A) = 4m$, then $J_m(B) = 0$, $\phi(B) = 1$, and B would not destabilize F. So $J_m(A) \in \{m, 2m, 3m\}$.

Observe that $\operatorname{Re} Z_m(F) = 0$, hence A destabilizes if $\operatorname{Re} Z_m(A) \leqslant 0$. Note that $A \in \mathbf{T}$ is torsion-free, so all its HN-factors have $\mu > -1$. Recall that:

$$\operatorname{Re}(Z_m([A])) = rm^2 - \frac{9r}{64} - \frac{c_1}{2} - \frac{\mathrm{ch}_2}{2} = \frac{1}{r}\left(-\chi(A,A) + m^2r^2 - \frac{1}{4}(r+c_1)^2\right).$$

Moreover, we can assume that A is μ-stable, so $-\chi(A,A) = \hom^1(A,A) - 1$. Hence $-1 \leqslant -\chi(A,A)$ and since $-\frac{9}{4} \leqslant -\frac{1}{4}(r+c_1)^2$, we have $m^2r^2 - \frac{13}{4} \leqslant 0$. Since $m > \frac{1}{4}$ and $r \in 4\mathbb{N}$, this implies $r = 4$.

We now have to go through a case by case study.

Case $J_m(A) = m$ and $J_m(\mathcal{H}^{-1}(B)) = -3m$. In this case $c_1 = -3$ and $\hom^1(A,A) - \frac{1}{4} < 0$, so A is rigid and $\mathrm{ch}_2 = \frac{5}{2}$, by (2.2.2). Hence, $A \cong \mathcal{B}_1$ and $[B] = [\mathcal{B}_1] - 2[\mathcal{B}_0]$. Moreover, since $16m^2 - \frac{5}{4} \leqslant 0$, then $m \leqslant \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{H}^0(B) \neq 0$ (e.g., $\mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{H}^0(B)) = (0,0,z)$) and we want to get a contradiction. Since $[B] = [\mathcal{B}_1] - 2[\mathcal{B}_0]$, we have $\chi(\mathcal{B}_0, B) = 0$ and $\mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{H}^{-1}(B)) = (4, -7, \frac{13}{2} + z)$. Hence, $0 = \hom^0(\mathcal{H}^{-1}(B), \mathcal{B}_{-1}) = \hom^2(\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{H}^{-1}(B))$. Thus, the exact triangle $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(B)[1] \to B \to \mathcal{H}^0(B)$ leads us to a contradiction.

Case $J_m(A) = 2m$ and $J_m(\mathcal{H}^{-1}(B)) = -2m$. Under this assumption $c_1 = -2$, which is impossible by [13, Lem. 2.13(ii)].

Case $J_m(A) = 3m$ and $J_m(\mathcal{H}^{-1}(B)) = -m$. Here $c_1 = -1$ and $\hom^1(A,A) - \frac{9}{4} < 0$, which implies $\hom^1(A,A) \leqslant 2$.

(a) If A is rigid, then $\mathrm{ch}_2 = \frac{3}{2}$, by (2.2.2). Hence $A \cong \mathcal{B}_2$, which is impossible since $0 \neq \hom(\mathcal{B}_2, F) = h^0(\mathbb{P}^2, F(-h))$ contradicts the semistability of F.

(b) If $\chi(A,A) = 0$, then $\mathrm{ch}_2 = 1$, by (2.2.2). This implies that $[A] \notin \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{B}_{-1} \oplus \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{B}_0 \oplus \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{B}_1$, which contradicts [13, Lem. 2.12].

(c) If $\chi(A,A) = -1$, then $\mathrm{ch}_2 = \frac{1}{2}$. Hence $[A] = -[\mathcal{B}_0] + 2[\mathcal{B}_1]$, so $B \cong \mathcal{B}_0[1]$. In particular, $\mathcal{H}^0(B) = 0$. Moreover, $16m^2 - \frac{5}{4} \leqslant 0$, so $m \leqslant \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}$.

Summarizing, if $F \in \mathfrak{N}_2$ is stable then it is σ_m-stable for all $m > \frac{1}{4}$. If $F \in \mathfrak{N}_2$ is properly semistable, then its two JH-factors are σ_m-stable for all $m > \frac{1}{4}$. If $F \in \mathfrak{M}_2 \setminus \mathfrak{N}_2$, then it admits a morphism from $\mathcal{B}_1$ and it has also an extension with $\mathcal{B}_0$. Indeed, since $\chi(\mathcal{B}_1, F) = 0$ we have $\hom(\mathcal{B}_1, F) = \hom^1(\mathcal{B}_1, F) = \hom^1(F, \mathcal{B}_0)$. Thus F lies simultaneously in the following exact sequences of coherent $\mathcal{B}_0$-modules

$$0 \to C \to \mathcal{B}_1 \to F \to 0, \qquad \text{where } [C] = 2[\mathcal{B}_0] - [\mathcal{B}_1],$$
$$0 \to \mathcal{B}_0 \to C' \to F \to 0, \qquad \text{where } [C'] = 2[\mathcal{B}_1] - [\mathcal{B}_0].$$

When $C \in \mathfrak{N}_1$, we fall in case (c.iii) and the JH-factors are $\mathcal{B}_0[1]$, $\mathcal{B}_1$ and the cokernel of $\mathcal{B}_1 \to C'$. When $C \in \mathfrak{M}_1 \setminus \mathfrak{N}_1$, we fall in case (c.iv). □

Remark 3.2. We want to 'count' the objects $F \in \mathfrak{M}_2$ that admit a JH-filtration like in case (c.iii) of Lemma 3.1. The σ_{m_0}-stable $\mathcal{B}_0$-module with numerical class $[\mathcal{B}_1] - [\mathcal{B}_0]$ needs to be $\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l)$ with $l \neq l_0$, by Lemma 2.13. We fix $l \neq l_0$.

On the one hand, we consider the extensions $C' \in \operatorname{Hom}^1(\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l), \mathcal{B}_1)$, where $\hom^1(\Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l), \mathcal{B}_1) = h^1(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-2)) = 1$ by Example 2.10. On the other hand, we consider the extensions

$F \in \operatorname{Hom}^1(\mathcal{B}_0[1], C')$ which fall into the following exact sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{B}_1) \to \operatorname{Hom}^1(\mathcal{B}_0[1], C') \to \operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{B}_0, \Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l)) \to 0,$$

so $\hom^1(\mathcal{B}_0[1], C') = 3$.

Summing up, we get that the $F \in \mathfrak{M}_2$ that admit a JH-filtration like in case (c.iii) of Lemma 3.1 are parametrized by $\mathbb{P}^2$, once we fix the $[\mathcal{B}_1] - [\mathcal{B}_0]$ JH-factor.

Let w be the numerical class $2[\mathcal{B}_1] - 2[\mathcal{B}_0]$. As a consequence of the previous lemma we get that $\mathfrak{M}_2$ embeds inside $\mathfrak{M}^{\sigma_m}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0; w)$ when $m > m_0$. With the aim of proving the other inclusion, we need the following lemma which adapts [43, Lem. 5.8] to our situation.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $m_1 > m_0 = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}$ and let G be a σ_{m_1}-(semi)stable object with numerical class w. Then G is σ_m-(semi)stable, for all $m \geqslant m_0$.*

Moreover, if $G \in \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^{\perp}$ and G is a σ_{m_0}-(semi)stable object, then G is σ_m-(semi)stable, for all $m \geqslant m_0$.

Proof. Assume, for a contradiction, that G destabilizes at $m \geqslant m_0$. Then we have an exact sequence in $\mathbf{A}$

$$0 \to A \to G \to B \to 0,$$

where $A \neq 0$ is σ_m-stable and $\operatorname{Re}(Z_m(A)) < 0$ (resp. $\leqslant 0$). Let $\operatorname{ch}(A) = (r, c_1, \operatorname{ch}_2)$. The same argument as in [43, Lem. 5.8] shows that $r \neq 0$ and $\operatorname{Im}(Z_m(A)) \in \{m, 2m, 3m\}$. But then, the same casuistry as in Lemma 3.1 shows that this can only happen when $m < m_0$ (resp. $m < m_0$ or $G \notin \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^{\perp}$). ☐

Now, let $G \in \mathfrak{M}^{\sigma_{m_1}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0; w)$ where $m_1 \geqslant m_0$. By Lemma 3.3, we have two possibilities: either G is σ_m-(semi)stable for all $m \geqslant m_0$, or $m_1 = m_0$, $G \notin \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^{\perp}$ and it destabilizes for all $m > m_0$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $G \in \mathbf{A}$ be a σ_m-(semi)stable object, for all $m \geqslant m_0$, with numerical class w. Then G is a (semi)stable $\mathcal{B}_0$-module pure of dimension 1.*

Proof. We argue as in [43, Lem. 5.9] to deduce that G is a pure $\mathcal{B}_0$-module of dimension 1. If A is a stable $\mathcal{B}_0$-module that destabilizes G, then $\operatorname{Re} Z_m(A) < 0$ (resp. $\leqslant 0$) so G would not be σ_m-semistable. ☐

As a straightforward consequence of the previous lemmas we get the following.

Corollary 3.5. *Let $w = 2[\mathcal{B}_1] - 2[\mathcal{B}_0]$. Then $\mathfrak{M}_2 = \mathfrak{M}^{\sigma_m}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0; w)$, for all $m > m_0 = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}$.*

3.2. **Instanton sheaves.** Now we want to give a geometric interpretation of $\mathfrak{M}^{\sigma_m}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0; w)$ for $m \leqslant m_0$. The appropriate objects are the instanton sheaves.

Definition 3.6. We say that $E \in \mathbf{Coh}(Y)$ is an *instanton sheaf* if E is a Gieseker semistable sheaf of rank 2 and Chern classes $c_1(E) = 0$ and $c_2(E) = 2$. When E is locally free, we call it *instanton bundle*.

An instanton sheaf according to the above definition would be called *instanton sheaf of charge* 2 in the existing literature. In general, an *instanton bundle of charge* $s \geqslant 2$ is a locally free sheaf E of rank 2 and Chern classes $c_1(E) = 0$ and $c_2(E) = s$ and such that $H^1(Y, E(-1)) = 0$ (see, for example, [34, Def. 2.4]). It is easy to show that if the charge is minimal (i.e. $c_2(E) = 2$), then the condition $H^1(Y, E(-1)) = 0$ is automatically satisfied (see [38, Cor. 3.3]).

Example 3.7. If $C' \subset Y$ is a smooth conic, the object F_2 constructed in Example 2.9 is a stable instanton sheaf which is not locally free. In fact, by [25, Thm. 3.5], these are the only stable instanton sheaves that are not locally free.

Given a stable instanton bundle E, then $E(1)$ is globally generated [25, Thm. 2.4], so E is an Ulrich bundle. Indeed, E is associated to a non-degenerate smooth elliptic quintic C via the Serre construction (see [25, Cor. 2.6] and compare it with Lemma 2.17).

Lemma 3.8. *Let E be a stable instanton bundle. Then $\Xi_3(E)$ is a stable $\mathcal{B}_0$-module.*

Proof. Let F be a stable instanton bundle of minimal charge. By [25, Cor. 2.6] a stable Ulrich bundle F of rank 2 is associated to a non-degenerate smooth elliptic quintic C via the Serre construction

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_Y(-H) \to F \to \mathcal{I}_C(H) \to 0. \tag{3.2.1}$$

Note that $\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{O}_Y(-H)) = \mathcal{B}_{-1}$ and $\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{O}_Y(H)) = \mathcal{B}_2[1]$. Applying the functor $\Psi \circ \sigma^*$ to the short exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{I}_C(H) \to \mathcal{O}_Y(H) \to \mathcal{O}_C(H) \to 0,$$

we get

$$0 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to \mathcal{B}_2 \xrightarrow{f} \Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{O}_C(H)) \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to 0. \tag{3.2.2}$$

On the other hand, from (3.2.1) we obtain

$$0 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*F)) \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \xrightarrow{g} \mathcal{B}_{-1} \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*F)) \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to 0. \tag{3.2.3}$$

Observe that $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_2$ is a non-trivial torsion-free sheaf of rank 4. Hence, the map g is either injective or zero.

Step 1: Assume that the associated elliptic quintic C does not intersect l_0. Since $C \cap l_0 = \emptyset$, we have $\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{O}_C(H)) = F_{\widetilde{C}}[1]$, where $F_{\widetilde{C}}$ is a rank 2 vector bundle supported on $\widetilde{C} = \pi(\sigma^{-1}(C)) \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. Hence, (3.2.2) becomes

$$0 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to \mathcal{B}_2 \xrightarrow{f} F_{\widetilde{C}} \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to 0.$$

On the one hand, note that f could be surjective, or zero, or have the cokernel supported on points.

We claim that g in (3.2.3) is injective. Assume, by contradiction that g is zero. Hence, we have the following exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{B}_{-1} \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*F)) \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to 0.$$

If $\mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H)))$ is supported at most in dimension 0, then we have $0 \neq \mathrm{Hom}^2(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_{-1}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}^2(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(F)))$. Note that we have an exact triangle

$$\mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*F))[1] \to \Psi(\sigma^*F) \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*F)),$$

so this would imply $\mathrm{Hom}^2(\mathcal{B}_1, \Psi(\sigma^*F)) \neq 0$. But $F \in \mathbf{T}_Y$, so $\Psi(\sigma^*F) \in \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^\perp$ and we get a contradiction. If f and g are zero, then $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*F)) = \mathcal{B}_2$ and we get a contradiction because $\mathrm{Hom}^0(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*F))) \neq 0$. The case when f is surjective and g is trivial can be excluded by a similar argument as we would have $\mathcal{B}_{-1} \cong \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*F))$.

Therefore, g is injective and $\Psi(\sigma^*F)$ is a torsion sheaf with class $2[\mathcal{B}_1] - 2[\mathcal{B}_0]$.

Step 2: Assume that the associated elliptic quintic C intersects l_0 transversally in a point. Since $C \cap l_0 = \{p\}$, we have $\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{O}_C(H)) = \Psi(\mathcal{O}_{C' \cup \gamma}(H))$, where by abuse of notation we denote by C' the strict transform of C and $\gamma \subset D$ is the line $\sigma^{-1}(p)$. Hence, (3.2.2) becomes

$$0 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to \mathcal{B}_2 \xrightarrow{f} \Psi(\mathcal{O}_{C'\cup\gamma}(H)) \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to 0. \tag{3.2.4}$$

To characterize $\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{C'\cup\gamma}(H))$ better, consider the exact sequence on $\mathbf{Coh}(\widetilde{Y})$

$$0 \to \mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H) \to \mathcal{O}_{C'\cup\gamma}(H) \to \mathcal{O}_\gamma(H) \to 0. \tag{3.2.5}$$

On the one hand, we need to compute $\Psi(\mathcal{O}_\gamma(H))$. As $\gamma \subset D$ it makes sense to consider the ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}_{\gamma,D}$ which is actually equal to $\mathcal{I}_{\sigma^{-1}(p),\sigma^{-1}(l_0)} = \sigma^*\mathcal{I}_{p,l_0} = \sigma^*(\mathcal{O}_{l_0}(-H)) = \mathcal{O}_D(-H)$. Now, tensoring the exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_D(-H) \to \mathcal{O}_D \to \mathcal{O}_\gamma \to 0$$

by $D = H - h$, we have

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_D(-h) \to \mathcal{O}_D(D) \to \mathcal{O}_\gamma(H-h) \to 0. \tag{3.2.6}$$

By [13, Ex. 2.11] and applying the functor Ψ, it provides the exact triangle

$$\mathcal{B}_{-1}[1] \to \mathcal{B}_0[1] \to \Psi(\mathcal{O}_\gamma(H-h)).$$

By construction, we know that $\Psi(\mathcal{O}_\gamma(H-h))$ is a torsion sheaf in degree -1 and we have the following exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{B}_{-1} \to \mathcal{B}_0 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_\gamma(H-h))) \to 0.$$

By definition $\Psi(F \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(mh)) = \pi_*(F \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(mh) \otimes \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h))[1] = \Psi(F) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(mh)$. Hence, if we tensor (3.2.6) by $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h)$ and we apply Ψ again, we get that $\Psi(\mathcal{O}_\gamma(H))$ is a torsion sheaf in degree -1 and the following exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{B}_1 \to \mathcal{B}_2 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_\gamma(H))) \to 0. \tag{3.2.7}$$

Note that, $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{B}_2, \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_\gamma(H)))) \cong \mathbb{C}$.

Using the above discussion and (3.2.5), we get the commutative diagram

(3.2.8)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & \\
 & 0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{B}_1 \arrow[d] & \\
 & & \mathcal{B}_2 \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d, "f"] & \mathcal{B}_2 \arrow[d] & \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H))) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{C'\cup\gamma}(H))) \arrow[r, "h"] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{\gamma}(H))) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
 & \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H))) \arrow[r] & \mathcal{H}^{0}(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \arrow[d] & 0 & \\
 & & 0 & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Furthermore, we have $\Psi(\mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H)) \cong F_{\widetilde{C'}}[1]$, where $F_{\widetilde{C'}}$ is a rank 2 vector bundle supported on $\widetilde{C'} = \pi(C') \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ which is irreducible. Indeed, by definition, $\Psi(\mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H)) = \pi_*(\mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H) \otimes \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h))[1]$. Since the fibers of π restricted to C' are only points or empty we have $\Psi(\mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H)) = R^0\pi_*(\mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H) \otimes \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h))[1]$, where $R^0\pi_*(\mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H) \otimes \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h))$ is a sheaf supported on $\widetilde{C'} = \pi(C')$. Observe that $C' \subset \widetilde{Y}$ is a quartic, so the image $\pi(C')$ is either a line, a conic, or a quartic in $\mathbb{P}^2$. The first two possibilities are not realized and this means that $C' \to \widetilde{C'}$ is birational. Hence, by base chance, $R^0\pi_*(\mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H) \otimes \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h))$ has rank on $\widetilde{C'}$ equal to the rank of $\mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H) \otimes \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h)$ on C', which is 2.

We claim that g in (3.2.3) is injective. Assume, by contradiction that g is zero. Hence, we have the following exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{B}_{-1} \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*F)) \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to 0$$

and we have two cases depending on the behaviour morphism $f' := h \circ f : \mathcal{B}_2 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_\gamma(H)))$.

Case (a.1). If the map f' is non-zero, then (3.2.8) yields the sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to \mathcal{B}_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} F_{\widetilde{C'}} \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to 0,$$

where f_1 could be either zero, or surjective, or have cokernel supported on points. If $\operatorname{coker} f_1 = \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H)))$ is supported at most in dimension 0, then we have $0 \neq \operatorname{Hom}^2(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_{-1}) \hookrightarrow \operatorname{Hom}^2(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*F)))$. So we get a contradiction with $\Psi(\sigma^*F) \in \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^\perp$. Assume that f_1 and g are both zero. Then $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*F)) = \mathcal{B}_1$ and we get a contradiction because $\operatorname{Hom}^0(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*F))) \neq 0$. Hence, f_1 is surjective and then, as in Step 1, g is injective.

Case (b.1). On the other hand, the map f' could be zero, so f would factor through $\mathcal{B}_2 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H)))$. In this case, we get a sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to \mathcal{B}_2 \xrightarrow{f_2} F_{\widetilde{C'}} \to K \to 0,$$

where f_2 could be either zero, or surjective, or have the cokernel supported on points. Moreover, we have

$$0 \to K \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_\gamma(H))) \to 0. \tag{3.2.9}$$

If K is supported at most in dimension 0, then

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H)))) = \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_\gamma(H)))) = 0,$$

by (3.2.9) and (3.2.7). So, again we have $0 \neq \mathrm{Hom}^2(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_{-1}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}^2(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*F)))$, contradicting $\Psi(\sigma^*F) \in \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^\perp$. If f_2 and g are zero, then $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*F)) = \mathcal{B}_2$ and we get a contradiction because $\mathrm{Hom}^0(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*F))) \neq 0$. As in the previous step, f cannot be surjective whenever g is trivial.

Therefore, g is injective and $\Psi(\sigma^*F)$ is a torsion sheaf with class $2[\mathcal{B}_1] - 2[\mathcal{B}_0]$.

Step 3: Assume that the associated elliptic quintic C intersects l_0 with multiplicity m in a point. Since $C \cap l_0 = \{p\}$ with multiplicity $m > 1$, with the notation of Step 2, we have $\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{O}_C(H)) = \Psi(\mathcal{O}_{C' \cup m\gamma}(H))$. Note that we have the following exact sequence on $\mathbf{Coh}(\widetilde{Y})$

$$0 \to \mathcal{I}_{mp,C'}(H) \to \mathcal{O}_{C' \cup m\gamma}(H) \to \mathcal{O}_{m\gamma}(H) \to 0. \tag{3.2.10}$$

Moreover $0 \to \mathcal{O}_{(m-1)\gamma}(H) \to \mathcal{O}_{m\gamma}(H) \to \mathcal{O}_\gamma(H) \to 0$, so $\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{m\gamma}(H))$ is a successive extension of $\Psi(\mathcal{O}_\gamma(H))$.

Then, we can also distinguish between two cases, depending on whether the morphism $\mathcal{B}_2 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{m\gamma}(H)))$ arising from (3.2.10) and (3.2.2) is either non-zero (Case (a.2)), or f factors through $\mathcal{B}_2 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H)))$ as in (3.2.2) (Case (b.2)).

If we are in Case (b.2), exactly the same arguments as in Case (b.1) show that $\Psi(\sigma^*F)$ is a torsion sheaf with class $2[\mathcal{B}_1] - 2[\mathcal{B}_0]$. So we can suppose that we are in Case (a.2) and we have the following diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & \\
 & 0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & K' \arrow[d] & \\
 & & \mathcal{B}_2 \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d, "f"] & \mathcal{B}_2 \arrow[d] & \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H))) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{C' \cup \gamma}(H))) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{m\gamma}(H))) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
 & \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H))) \arrow[r] & \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & L' \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
 & & 0 & 0 &
\end{tikzcd}$$

By the Horseshoe Lemma we have the following exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{B}_1^{\oplus m} \to \mathcal{B}_2^{\oplus m} \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{m\gamma}(H))) \to 0.$$

So, we have that $K' \cong \mathcal{B}_1$ and $L' \cong \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{(m-1)\gamma}(H)))$ and we get the following

$$0 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to \mathcal{B}_1 \xrightarrow{f_3} F_{\widetilde{C'}} \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{(m-1)\gamma}(H))) \to 0,$$

where f_3 could be either zero, or surjective, or have the cokernel supported on points.

We claim that g in (3.2.3) is injective. Running the same machinery as in the previous steps, we assume, by contradiction, that g is zero. Hence, we have the following exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{B}_{-1} \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*F)) \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) \to 0.$$

If coker f_3 is supported at most in dimension 0,

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H))) = \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{m\gamma}(H)))) = 0.$$

So, we have $0 \neq \mathrm{Hom}^2(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_{-1}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}^2(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*F)))$, contradicting $\Psi(\sigma^*F) \in \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^{\perp}$. So, it remains to deal with the case when f_3 and g are zero. But then $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*F)) = \mathcal{B}_1$ and we get a contradiction because $\mathrm{Hom}^0(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*F))) \neq 0$.

If f factors through $\mathcal{B}_2 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{I}_{p,C'}(H)))$ and K is supported at most in dimension 0, then

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_C(H)))) = \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{\gamma}(H)))) = 0,$$

by (3.2.9) and (3.2.7). So, again we have $0 \neq \mathrm{Hom}^2(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_{-1}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}^2(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^0(\Psi(\sigma^*F)))$ and we get a contradiction with $\Psi(\sigma^*F) \in \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^{\perp}$. As in the previous steps, if f_2 and g are zero, then $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*F)) = \mathcal{B}_2$ and we get a contradiction because $\mathrm{Hom}^0(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Psi(\sigma^*F))) \neq 0$. Therefore, $\Psi(\sigma^*F)$ is a torsion sheaf with class $2[\mathcal{B}_1] - 2[\mathcal{B}_0]$.

Step 4: Assume that the associated elliptic quintic C intersects l_0 in s distinct points (possibly with multiplicity). Since $C \cap l_0 = \{p_1, \dots, p_s\}$, with the notation of Steps 2 and 3, we have $\Psi(\sigma^*\mathcal{O}_C(H)) = \Psi(\mathcal{O}_{C' \cup m_1\gamma_1 \cup \ldots \cup m_s\gamma_s}(H))$. Note that we have the following exact sequence in $\mathbf{Coh}(\widetilde{Y})$

$$0 \to \mathcal{I}_{m_1p_1 \cup \ldots \cup m_sp_s, C'}(H) \to \mathcal{O}_{C' \cup m_1\gamma_1 \cup \ldots \cup m_s\gamma_s}(H) \to \bigoplus_{i=1}^{s} \mathcal{O}_{m_i\gamma_i}(H) \to 0, \tag{3.2.11}$$

since γ_i are disjoint. Then, we can reduce to the previous steps.

From Step 1-4, we get that if F is a stable Ulrich bundle of rank 2, then $\Psi(\sigma^*F)$ is a torsion sheaf with class $2[\mathcal{B}_1] - 2[\mathcal{B}_0]$.

Step 5: We can now show that $\Psi(\sigma^*F)$ is stable. Suppose it is not, and let $E \hookrightarrow \Psi(\sigma^*F)$ be a destabilizing $\mathcal{B}_0$-module. Then, $\mathrm{ch}(E) = (0, 2, z)$ for some $z > -2$. Since $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{B}_1, E) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{B}_1, \Psi(\sigma^*F)) = 0$, then $\chi(\mathcal{B}_1, E) \leqslant 0$. By (2.2.3), we have $z = -2$ and $E \in \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^{\perp}$. By [13, Thm. 4.1], one gets that $E \cong \Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l)$ for some line $l \in F(Y) \setminus \{l_0\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_l \hookrightarrow F$ contradicts the stability of F. $\square$

Denote by $\mathfrak{M}_Y^{inst}$ the moduli space of semistable instanton sheaves. By [25, Thm. 4.8], $\mathfrak{M}_Y^{inst}$ is isomorphic to the blow-up of the intermediate Jacobian $J(Y)$ of Y along $-F(Y)$, where $F(Y)$ is the Fano surface of lines in Y. Moreover the exceptional divisor is the closure of the locus of stable instanton sheaves that are not locally-free.

Theorem 3.9. *Let $\nu : X \to J(Y)$ be the blow-up of the intermediate Jacobian along $F(Y) \cup -F(Y)$. The moduli space $\mathfrak{M}_2$ is isomorphic to the blow-up of X along $\nu^{-1}(l_0)$.*

Proof. Let E be a semistable instanton sheaf. We claim that if $\Xi_3(E) \in \mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$, then $\Xi_3(E) \in \mathfrak{M}_2$ (i.e. it is semistable) and, by Lemma 3.1, $\Xi_3(E) \in \mathfrak{M}^{\sigma_m}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0; w)$ for all $m > \frac{1}{4}$.

By [25, Thm. 3.5] and [13, Ex. 2.4, Ex. 2.11, Step 5 in Prop. 3.3], we can distinguish three cases where $\Xi_3(E) \in \mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$:

- if E is a stable instanton bundle, then $\Xi_3(E) \in \mathfrak{M}_2$ follows from Lemma 3.8;
- if E is a stable instanton sheaf which is not locally free, then $\Xi_3(E) \in \mathfrak{M}_2$ follows from Examples 2.9 and 3.7;
- if E is a properly semistable sheaf and the 2 JH-factors are $\mathcal{I}_l$ and $\mathcal{I}_{l'}$, where eventually $l = l'$, but in any case $l, l' \neq l_0$, then $\Xi_3(E) \in \mathfrak{M}_2$ follows from a direct computation.

Hence, the only case in which $\Xi_3(E) \notin \mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ is when E is a properly semistable sheaf and $\mathcal{I}_{l_0}$ is a JH-factor. Thus, this is the only case where $\Xi_3(E) \notin \mathfrak{M}_2$.

When $\mathcal{I}_{l_0}$ and $\mathcal{I}_l$, $l \neq l_0$, are the JH-factors of E, then $\hom(\Xi_3(E), \mathcal{B}_1) = 1$. Hence, the HN-filtration of $\Xi_3(E)$ for $m > m_0 := \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}$ is

$$\mathcal{B}_0[1] \subset C[1] \subset \Xi_3(E),$$

where $0 \to C[1] \to \Xi_3(E) \to \mathcal{B}_1 \to 0$ and $0 \to \mathcal{B}_0[1] \to C[1] \to \Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l) \to 0$ are exact sequences in the abelian category $\mathbf{A}$ which is the heart of the bounded t-structure in the stability condition in Lemma 2.6.

When the two JH-factors of E are both isomorphic to $\mathcal{I}_{l_0}$, then $\hom(\Xi_3(E), \mathcal{B}_1) = 2$. Hence, the HN-filtration of $\Xi_3(E)$ for $m > m_0 := \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}$ is

$$\mathcal{B}_0[1] \subset C''[1] \subset C[1] \subset \Xi_3(E),$$

where $C'', C \in \mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ have respectively class $[\mathcal{B}_0] - [\mathcal{B}_1]$ and $2[\mathcal{B}_0] - [\mathcal{B}_1]$.

In both cases, this means that $\Xi_3(E)$ is σ_{m_0}-semistable respectively with JH-factors $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_0[1]$ and D or twice $\mathcal{B}_0[1]$ and twice $\mathcal{B}_1$. As a consequence, up to choosing ε close to m_0, $\Xi_3(E)$ is σ_m-stable, for all $m \in (\varepsilon, m_0)$. Indeed, if not, by [16, Prop. 9.3], the HN-factors of $\Xi_3(E)$ in the stability condition σ_m, for $m \in (\varepsilon, m_0)$, would survive in the stability condition σ_{m_0}. This would contradict the σ_{m_0}-semistability of $\Xi_3(E)$. This implies, by Lemma 3.3, that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Xi_3(E) \notin \mathfrak{M}^{\sigma_m}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0; w) && \text{for } m > m_0 := \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}, \\ &\Xi_3(E) \in \mathfrak{M}^{\sigma_m}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0; w) && \text{for } m \in (m_0 - \varepsilon, m_0] \text{ and } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ small enough.} \end{aligned}$$

If we look now from the other side of the wall ($m > m_0$), where we know that $\mathfrak{M}^{\sigma_m}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0; w) = \mathfrak{M}_2$ (see Corollary 3.5), then we also have two cases.

Indeed, on the one hand, we have the elements $F \in \mathfrak{M}_2$ that have three JH-factors, i.e. the ones in Lemma 3.1(c.iii), that get contracted to $\Xi_3(E)$, where E is an extension of $\mathcal{I}_{l_0}$ and $\mathcal{I}_l$

$(l \neq l_0)$. So, the corresponding $\mathbb{P}^2$-bundle on $F(Y) \setminus \{l_0\}$ gets contracted to $F(Y) \setminus \{l_0\}$, by Remark 3.2.

On the other hand, we have the elements $F \in \mathfrak{M}_2$ that have four JH-factors, i.e. the ones in Lemma 3.1(c.iv), that get contracted to $\Xi_3(E)$, where $E \in \operatorname{Ext}^1_Y(\mathcal{I}_{l_0}, \mathcal{I}_{l_0})$. Note that this case is a specialization of the previous one. Hence, we need to count how many extensions get contracted to the 'second' factor. The situation is parallel to the previous case, so there is a $\mathbb{P}^2$ contracting to every point of the previous $\mathbb{P}^2$. That is, we have that $\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ gets contracted to $\{l_0\}$.

Now, the only thing that remains to be proven is that, for $m \in (m_0 - \varepsilon, m_0)$, the objects $\Xi_3(E)$ are the only σ_m-semistable objects in $\mathbf{A}$ with class $w = 2[\mathcal{B}_1] - 2[\mathcal{B}_0]$. Let $G \in \mathbf{A}$ be a σ_m-semistable object, for some $m \in (m_0 - \varepsilon, m_0)$, with class w. We claim that $G \in \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^{\perp}$. We argue by contradiction. Suppose that $G \notin \langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^{\perp}$. and we want to get a contradiction with the σ_m-stability for $m < m_0$. Indeed, when $\hom(\mathcal{B}_1, G) \neq 0$, then the inclusion $\mathcal{B}_1 \hookrightarrow G$ in $\mathbf{A}$ destabilizes G for $m \in (m_0 - \varepsilon, m_0)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough. On the other hand, if $\hom^1(\mathcal{B}_1, G) = \hom(G, \mathcal{B}_0[1]) \neq 0$, then the surjection $G \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{B}_0[1]$ in $\mathbf{A}$ destabilizes G for $m \in (m_0 - \varepsilon, m_0)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough.

By [16, Prop. 9.3], up to replacing ε, we can assume that all such objects G are σ_{m_0}-semistable. By Lemma 3.3, we have two possibilities: either G is σ_m-semistable for all $m \geqslant m_0$, or G is properly σ_{m_0}-semistable and destabilizes for all $m > m_0$. In the first case, G is a (semi)stable element of $\mathfrak{N}_2$ by Lemma 3.4 and the discussion before. Thus, by the proof of Proposition 2.20, $\Xi_3^{-1}(G)$ is either a balanced ACM bundle of rank 2 (i.e. an instanton bundle) or a sheaf obtained via the Serre construction from a smooth conic in Y (i.e. an instanton sheaf which is not locally free).

If G destabilizes for all $m > m_0$, we want to see that $G \cong \Xi_3(E)$ where E is a properly semistable sheaf with $\mathcal{I}_{l_0}$ as a JH-factor. Indeed, since G is properly σ_{m_0}-semistable, let G_1 and G_2 be its JH-factors. Then G_1 and G_2 are of class $[\mathcal{B}_1] - [\mathcal{B}_0]$ and they lie in $\langle \mathcal{B}_1 \rangle^{\perp}$, by the same argument as before. Hence, from Lemma 2.13 we deduce that $G_i \cong \Xi_3(\mathcal{I}_l)$ for some line, and at least one of the lines is l_0. $\square$

As a corollary of the previous proof we get the following result.

Corollary 3.10. *Let* $w = 2[\mathcal{B}_1] - 2[\mathcal{B}_0]$ *and* $m_0 = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{8}$. *Then* $\mathfrak{M}_Y^{inst} = \mathfrak{M}^{\sigma_m}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0; w)$, *for all* $m \in (m_0 - \varepsilon, m_0]$ *and* $\varepsilon > 0$ *sufficiently small.*

Remark 3.11. From Theorem 2.11 we get a $2^8 : 1$ map from the moduli space of quintic elliptic curves on a cubic threefold to the projective space of conics in $\mathbb{P}^2$.

Since we have chosen l_0 general (i.e. such that for any other line l meeting l_0, the plane containing them intersects the cubic in three distinct lines), then $l_0 \notin C_{l_0} = F(Y) \cap (-F(Y))$ (e.g. [40, Sect. 5]). The curve $C_{l_0} \subset J(Y)$ is the Abel-Prym curve of lines inside Y that intersect l_0.

Remark 3.12. The space $\mathfrak{M}_2$ had already appeared in the literature with another presentation. Indeed, consider the quintic plane curve Δ, which is the ramification locus of the projection π from l_0 onto $\mathbb{P}^2$. Let $\widetilde{\Delta}$ be the variety of lines contained in Y and meeting l_0. The conic bundle π induces an étale double cover $\eta : \widetilde{\Delta} \to \Delta$. The Prym variety $P(\widetilde{\Delta}, \Delta)$ associated to this double cover is isomorphic to $J(Y)$. We can consider the special variety

$$X^- = \left\{ D \in \widetilde{\Delta}^{(10)} \,\middle|\, \eta^{(10)}(D) \in |\omega_\Delta| \text{ and } h^0(\widetilde{\Delta}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\Delta}}(D)) \equiv 1 \mod 2 \right\},$$

where $N^{(10)}$ denotes the 10^{th} symmetric product of a curve N and $\eta^{(10)} : \widetilde{\Delta}^{(10)} \to \Delta^{(10)}$ is the natural map induced by η. By [40, Sect. 5], X^- determines the Prym covering, so $\mathfrak{M}_2$ determines Y and the line of projection.

X^- is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{M}_2$. Indeed, this follows from the presentation of the element in $\mathfrak{M}_2$ given in Step 2 in the proof of Theorem 2.11 (see (2.4.8)). A point in $\mathfrak{M}_2$ is determined by a conic C and $\lambda_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for $i = 3, \dots, 10$. Since $\omega_\Delta = \mathcal{O}_\Delta(2)$, the divisors in $|\omega_\Delta|$ correspond to the conics in $\mathbb{P}^2$. Choosing a point in $\widetilde{\Delta}^{(10)}$ such that $\eta^{(10)}(D) = C \in |\omega_\Delta|$ is equivalent to choose $\lambda_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, 10$. Taking $\lambda \in \{0, 1\}$ corresponds to choose a preimage $\eta^{-1}(p_i)$. The condition $h^0(\widetilde{\Delta}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\Delta}}(D)) \equiv 1 \mod 2$, corresponds to the restriction $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$.

In general, $\mathfrak{M}_d$ can be realized as a subvariety of $\widetilde{\Delta}^{(2d)}$. Hence, the moduli spaces of ACM bundles in $\mathbf{T}_Y$ provide a birational model of some special varieties associated to the Prym variety. This birational model is specially interesting because it is intrinsic to Y and independent of the line of projection.

4. Cubic fourfolds containing a plane

In this section we prove Theorem C by constructing a family of stable ACM bundles which are parametrized by the K3 surface naturally associated to a cubic fourfold containing a plane.

4.1. **Geometry of cubic fourfolds with a plane.** In this section, we let $Y \subset \mathbb{P}^5$ be a cubic fourfold containing a plane P. Consider the blow-up $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$ of $\mathbb{P}^5$ along P. We set $q : \widetilde{\mathbb{P}} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ to be the $\mathbb{P}^3$-bundle induced by the projection from P onto a plane and we denote by $\widetilde{Y}$ the strict transform of Y via this blow-up. The restriction of q to $\widetilde{Y}$ induces a quadric fibration $\pi : \widetilde{Y} \to \mathbb{P}^2$. In particular, the discussion in Section 1.3 applies to $\widetilde{Y}$ (note that the vector bundle E on $S = \mathbb{P}^2$ is now $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^{\oplus 3} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-h)$).

The fibres of π degenerate along a sextic $C \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. The curve C has at most ordinary double points. On the one hand, over the smooth points of C the fibres are cones with one singular point. On the other hand, over the singular points of C the fibre is the union of two planes intersecting along a line. For the general cubic fourfold containing a plane, the sextic C is smooth. The double cover over $f \colon S \to \mathbb{P}^2$ ramified along C is a projective K3 surface (singular over the singular points of C). The geometric picture can be summarized by the following diagram

(4.1.1)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
D \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d, "s"'] & \widetilde{Y} \arrow[r, hook, "\alpha"] \arrow[d, "\sigma"'] \arrow[dr, "\pi"'] & \widetilde{\mathbb{P}} = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^{\oplus 3} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-h)) \arrow[d, "q"'] & S \arrow[dl, "f"] \\
P \arrow[r, hook] & Y \subset \mathbb{P}^5 & \mathbb{P}^2 \supset C. &
\end{tikzcd}$$

We let $D \subset \widetilde{Y}$ be the exceptional divisor of the blow-up $\sigma : \widetilde{Y} \to Y$. We denote by h both the class of a line in $\mathbb{P}^2$ and its pull-backs to $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$ and $\widetilde{Y}$ and, accordingly, we call H both the class of a hyperplane in $\mathbb{P}^5$ and its pull-backs to Y, $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$, and $\widetilde{Y}$. We recall that $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(D) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H - h)$, the relative ample line bundle is $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}}(H)$, the relative canonical bundle is $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}}(h - 2H)$, and the dualizing sheaf of $\widetilde{Y}$ is $\omega_{\widetilde{Y}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h - 2H)$ (see, e.g., [35, Lem. 4.1]).

The sheaf of even (resp. odd) parts of the Clifford algebra corresponding to π (see Section 1.3) specializes in this case to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_0 &\cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-h)^{\oplus 3} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-2h)^{\oplus 3} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-3h), \\ \mathcal{B}_1 &\cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}^{\oplus 3} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-h)^{\oplus 2} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-2h)^{\oplus 3}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.2}$$

as sheaves of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}$-modules. Moreover the rank 2 vector bundles $\mathcal{E}'$ and $\mathcal{E}$ sit in the short exact sequences provided by (1.3.1) and (1.3.3) respectively.

In [35, Thm. 4.3], Kuznetsov constructs an equivalence $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0) \cong \mathbf{T}_Y$, where $\mathbf{T}_Y$ is the full subcategory in (1.2.1). The way this equivalence is attained is by performing a precise sequence of mutations which allow Kuznetsov to compare the semiorthogonal decomposition in Theorem 1.13 and the one

$$\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\widetilde{Y}) = \langle \sigma^*(\mathbf{T}_Y), \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H), \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H), i_*\mathcal{O}_D, i_*\mathcal{O}_D(H), i_*\mathcal{O}_D(2H) \rangle$$

obtained by thinking of $\widetilde{Y}$ as the blow-up of Y along P and using [50]. The details will not be needed in the rest of this paper but we just recall that

$$\mathbf{T}_Y = \sigma_* \circ \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)} \circ \mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)} \circ \Phi(\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)),$$

where Φ is the embedding described in Section 1.3 and defined in terms of $\mathcal{E}'$. For later use we set

$$\Xi_4 := (\sigma_* \circ \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)} \circ \mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)} \circ \Phi)^{-1} : \mathbf{T}_Y \to \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0). \tag{4.1.3}$$

4.2. **The derived category of the associated K3 surface.** Let S be the K3 surface associated to a cubic fourfold containing a plane, as in (4.1.1). By [36, Sect. 3.5], there exists a sheaf of algebras $\mathcal{A}_0$ such that $f_*(\mathcal{A}_0) = \mathcal{B}_0$ and $f_* : \mathbf{Coh}(S, \mathcal{A}_0) \to \mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$ is an equivalence. Moreover, by [36, Prop. 3.13], $\mathcal{A}_0$ restricted to the smooth locus S_{reg} of S is a sheaf of Azumaya algebras. For the basic properties of Azumaya algebras, see [47, Ch. IV] or [19, Chapter 1].

When C is smooth, we can describe the category $\mathbf{Coh}(S, \mathcal{A}_0)$ in terms of twisted sheaves. More precisely, there exist $\alpha \in \mathrm{Br}(S)$ in the *Brauer group* of S, $\alpha^2 = \mathrm{id}$, and an α-twisted vector bundle of rank 2, $E_\alpha \in \mathbf{Coh}(S, \alpha)$, such that $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{E}nd(E_\alpha)$ and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Coh}(S, \alpha) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathbf{Coh}(S, \mathcal{A}_0) \\ F & \longmapsto & F \otimes E_\alpha^\vee = \mathcal{H}om(E_\alpha, F) \end{array}$$

is an equivalence of categories. When C is singular, the vector bundle E_α still exists étale locally on smooth points.

Let $x \in S_{\mathrm{reg}}$. Consider $L_x := f_*(\mathbb{C}(x) \otimes E_\alpha^\vee) \in \mathbf{Coh}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)$. As an $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}$-module it is isomorphic to $V \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}(f(x))$, where V is a 2-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$-vector space.

Lemma 4.1. *As $\mathcal{B}_0$-module L_x takes the form:*

- (i) *If $f(x) \notin C$, then $\mathcal{B}_0|_{f(x)} \cong \mathrm{End}(V) \times \mathrm{End}(V)$ and it acts on V via one of the two projections $\mathrm{End}(V) \times \mathrm{End}(V) \to \mathrm{End}(V)$.*
- (ii) *If $f(x) \in C_{\mathrm{reg}}$, then $\mathcal{B}_0|_{f(x)} \cong \mathrm{End}(V)$ and it acts on V via the standard representation.*

Proof. This follows directly from [36, Lem. 2.6 and Prop. 3.13]. □

4.3. **A family of sheaves on cubic fourfolds containing a plane.** In this section we want to describe a family of bundles parametrized by the K3 surface S describe in Section 4.2. More precisely, for $x \in S_{\mathrm{reg}}$ and setting

$$M_x := \Xi_4^{-1}(L_x)[-1] \in \mathrm{D^b}(Y), \tag{4.3.1}$$

we get the following.

Proposition 4.2. *For all $x \in S_{\mathrm{reg}}$, the object M_x is a coherent sheaf with class*

$$\mathrm{ch}(M_x) = (4, -2H, -P, l, \tfrac{1}{4}) \in H^*(Y, \mathbb{Q}).$$

The proof will be carried out in the rest of this section and it is divided up in several steps. Moreover, in Section 4.4, we will show that M_x is actually a stable ACM bundle.

We denote by $\widetilde{Q}_{f(x)}$ the fibre of $\pi\colon \widetilde{Y} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ over $f(x)$ and by $\widetilde{l}_x \subset \widetilde{Q}_{f(x)}$ a line in the ruling corresponding to $x \in S_{\mathrm{reg}}$. Recall that the points in S_{reg} parametrize rulings of lines in the quadric fibration π. When it is clear from the context, we will denote $\widetilde{Q}_{f(x)}$ simply by $\widetilde{Q}$ and $\widetilde{l}_x$ by l.

Step 1: Kuznetsov's embedding. We first want to prove that

$$\Phi(L_x) \cong \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l}_x, \widetilde{Q}_{f(x)}}, \tag{4.3.2}$$

where $\mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l}_x, \widetilde{Q}_{f(x)}}$ is the ideal sheaf of $\widetilde{l}_x$ in $\widetilde{Q}_{f(x)}$.

Indeed, by definition $\Phi(L_x) = \pi^* L_x \otimes_{\pi^*\mathcal{B}_0} \mathcal{E}' \in \mathrm{D^b}(\widetilde{Y})$. Since π is flat and $\mathcal{E}'$ is $\pi^*\mathcal{B}_0$-flat, we have $\Phi(L_x) \in \mathbf{Coh}(\widetilde{Y})$. As α is a closed immersion, also $\alpha_*\Phi(L_x)$ is a sheaf, i.e. $\alpha_*\Phi(L_x) \in \mathbf{Coh}(\widetilde{\mathbb{P}})$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_*\Phi(L_x) &\cong \alpha_*(\pi^* L_x \otimes_{\pi^*\mathcal{B}_0} \mathcal{E}') \\ &\cong q^* L_x \otimes_{q^*\mathcal{B}_0} \alpha_*\mathcal{E}'.\end{aligned}$$

where we used the Projection Formula for the fist isomorphism and the identity $\pi = q \circ \alpha$ for the second one. Since $\alpha_*\Phi(L_x)$ is a sheaf, if we tensor the exact sequence (1.3.1) by q^*L_x, then we get an exact sequence:

$$0 \to q^*L_x \otimes_{q^*\mathcal{B}_0} q^*\mathcal{B}_0(-2H) \xrightarrow{\delta} q^*L_x \otimes_{q^*\mathcal{B}_0} q^*\mathcal{B}_1(-H) \to q^*L_x \otimes_{q^*\mathcal{B}_0} \alpha_*\mathcal{E}' \to 0. \tag{4.3.3}$$

The first term in the previous exact sequence is

$$\begin{aligned}q^*L_x \otimes_{q^*\mathcal{B}_0} q^*\mathcal{B}_0(-2H) &\cong (q^*L_x \otimes_{q^*\mathcal{B}_0} q^*\mathcal{B}_0) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}}} \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}}(-2H) \\ &= q^*L_x \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}}} \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}}(-2H) \\ &= \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-2)^{\oplus 2},\end{aligned}$$

where in the first isomorphism we have used the non-commutative associativity (e.g., [26, Prop. A2.1]) and the fact that $q^*\mathcal{B}_0(-2H) = q^*\mathcal{B}_0 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}}} \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}}(-2H)$.

The action of $\mathcal{B}_0$ on L_x is controlled by Lemma 4.1. The map δ in (4.3.3) corresponds to $\delta_{-1,1}$ in [36, Sect. 3.4]. Hence, the second term of (4.3.3) is $q^*L_x \otimes_{q^*\mathcal{B}_0} q^*\mathcal{B}_1(-H) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1)^{\oplus 2}$ and

$$q^*L_x \otimes_{q^*\mathcal{B}_0} q^*\mathcal{B}_0(-2H) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-2)^{\oplus 2} \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1)^{\oplus 2} \cong q^*L_x \otimes_{q^*\mathcal{B}_0} q^*\mathcal{B}_1(-H). \tag{4.3.4}$$

is the "matrix factorization" of the quadric $\widetilde{Q}_{f(x)} = \pi^{-1}(f(x))$. Therefore, $\Phi(L_x)$ is the cokernel of the matrix factorization map, namely the ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l}_x, \widetilde{Q}_{f(x)}}$. This is well explained in [1].

Step 2: the right mutation. Set $\Phi'(L_x) := \mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)}\Phi(L_x)$. We want to show that $\Phi'(L_x)$ sits in the following distinguished triangle

$$\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)^{\oplus 2}[1] \to \Phi'(L_x) \to \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l}_x,\widetilde{Q}_{f(x)}}. \tag{4.3.5}$$

By Step 1, we have

$$\Phi'(L_x) = \mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)}(\mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}}) = \mathrm{cone}\left(\mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}^{\vee}} \mathrm{RHom}(\mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}},\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h))^{\vee} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)\right)[-1].$$

Now, we observe that

$$\mathrm{Ext}^p(\mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}},\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)) \cong H^{4-p}(\widetilde{Y},\mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}}(-2H)) \cong H^{4-p}(\widetilde{Q},\mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}}(-2)),$$

where the first isomorphism follows from Serre duality and the fact that $K_{\widetilde{Y}} = -2H - h$, while for the second one, we use that $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}}(H)$ is a relative ample line bundle.

Since $\widetilde{l}$ is a line in the quadric $\widetilde{Q}$, we have

$$H^{4-p}(\widetilde{Q},\mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}}(-2)) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C}^2 & \text{if } p = 2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence we get the distinguished triangle (4.3.5).

Step 3: the left mutation. Set $\Phi''(L_x) := \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)}\mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)}\Phi(L_x)$. We want to show that $\Phi''(L_x)[-1]$ is isomorphic to a sheaf sitting in the following non-split short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)^{\oplus 2} \longrightarrow \Phi''(L_x)[-1] \longrightarrow \widetilde{K}_x \longrightarrow 0, \tag{4.3.6}$$

where $\widetilde{K}_x$ is defined as the kernel of the evaluation map $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)^{\oplus 2} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}} \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l}_x,\widetilde{Q}_{f(x)}}$.

We have by definition

$$\Phi''(L_x) = \mathrm{cone}\left(\mathrm{RHom}(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H),\Phi'(L_x)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}} \Phi'(L_x)\right).$$

By Step 2, we need to compute $\mathrm{Ext}^p(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H),\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)^{\oplus 2})$ and $\mathrm{Ext}^p(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H),\mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}})$. On the one hand, we have the following natural isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Ext}^p(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H),\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)^{\oplus 2}) = \cong{}& H^p(\widetilde{Y},\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-2h+H))^{\oplus 2} \\ \cong{}& H^{4-p}(\widetilde{Y},\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-3H))^{\oplus 2} \\ \cong{}& H^{4-p}(\widetilde{Y},\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-D)\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-2H))^{\oplus 2} \\ \cong{}& H^{4-p}(Y,\mathcal{I}_{P,Y}(-2H))^{\oplus 2} = 0,\end{aligned}$$

where the first isomorphisms follows from Serre duality and of the fact that $K_{\widetilde{Y}} = -2H + h$. For the third one we use that D is the exceptional divisor of σ. On the other hand,

$$\mathrm{Ext}^p(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H),\mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}}) = H^p(\tilde{Y},\mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}}(H)) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C}^2 & p = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore, $\Phi''(L_x) = \mathrm{cone}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)^{\oplus 2} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}} \Phi'(L_x)\right)$.

Taking cohomology and using the results in Step 2, we get

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)^{\oplus 2} \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\Phi''(L_x)) \to \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)^{\oplus 2} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}} \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}} \to \mathcal{H}^0(\Phi''(L_x)) \to 0$$

Note that the evaluation map $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)^{\oplus 2} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}} \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}}$ is surjective and non-split. Hence, $\mathcal{H}^0(\Phi''(L_x)) = 0$ and $\Phi''(L_x)$ sits in the non-split triangle

$$\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)^{\oplus 2}[1] \to \Phi''(L_x) \to \widetilde{K}_x[1].$$

Step 4: the blow-up. Finally we prove that $M_x = \Xi_4^{-1}(L_x)[-1]$ is isomorphic to a sheaf sitting in the non-split short exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_Y(-H)^{\oplus 2} \to M_x \to K_x \to 0, \tag{4.3.7}$$

where K_x is defined as the kernel of the evaluation map $\mathcal{I}^{\oplus 2}_{P,Y} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}} \mathcal{I}_{l_x,Q_{f(x)}}$. Here $P \subset Y$ is the plane contained in Y and l_x and $Q_{f(x)}$ are the images of $\widetilde{l}_x$ and $\widetilde{Q}_{f(x)}$.

Indeed, we know that $\Phi''(L_x)$ is an element on $\sigma^*\mathbf{T}_Y$. Hence, by the Projection Formula, M_x is a sheaf. We only need to study $\sigma_*\widetilde{K}_x$ because $\sigma_*\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h) \cong \mathcal{O}_Y(-H)$. The fact that $M_x \in \mathbf{Coh}(Y)$ implies that $\sigma_*\widetilde{K}_x$ is also a sheaf that we denote by K_x. Since $\sigma|_{\widetilde{Q}}$ is an isomorphism, $\sigma_*\mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l}_x,\widetilde{Q}_{f(x)}} \cong \mathcal{I}_{l_x,Q_{f(x)}}$. Since $D = H-h$ is the exceptional divisor of σ, we have $\sigma_*\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H) \cong \mathcal{I}_{P,Y}$.

For later use, we give two different descriptions of the sheaf K_x. Given the quadric $Q_{f(x)}$ and a line l_x in it, we denote by l'_x any line in the second ruling not containing l_x. When $Q_{f(x)}$ is a cone, we set $l'_x = l_x$.

Lemma 4.3. *The sheaf K_x sits in the following (non-split) short exact sequences*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}^{\oplus 2}_{P\cup Q_{f(x)},Y} \longrightarrow K_x \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{l'_x,Q_{f(x)}}(-H) \longrightarrow 0, \tag{4.3.8}$$

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q_{f(x)},Y} \longrightarrow K_x \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{P\cup l'_x,Y} \longrightarrow 0. \tag{4.3.9}$$

Proof. Recall that $K_x \cong \sigma_*\widetilde{K}_x$, where $\widetilde{K}_x := \ker(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)^{\oplus 2} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}} \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}})$. Denoting by $i\colon \widetilde{Q} \hookrightarrow \widetilde{Y}$ the closed embedding, it is not difficult to see that the morphism $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)^{\oplus 2} \to \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}}$ factors through $i_*i^*\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)^{\oplus 2} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Q}}(-H)^{\oplus 2}$ as the composition $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)^{\oplus 2} \to \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Q}}(-H)^{\oplus 2} \to \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}}$.

Thus we have the following commutative diagram

(4.3.10)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & & \\
 & \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{Q},\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)^{\oplus 2} \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{Q},\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)^{\oplus 2} \arrow[d] & & \\
0 \arrow[r] & \widetilde{K}_x \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)^{\oplus 2} \arrow[r, "\mathrm{ev}"] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l}',\widetilde{Q}}(-H) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Q}}(-H)^{\oplus 2} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}} \arrow[r] & 0, \\
 & 0 & 0 & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

because the kernel of the surjective morphism $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Q}}(-H)^{\oplus 2} \to \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}}$ described above is precisely $\mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l}',\widetilde{Q}}(-H)$. Here $\widetilde{l}'$ is a line in the ruling opposite to the one containing $\widetilde{l}$ if $\widetilde{Q}$ is non-degenerate while, when $\widetilde{Q}$ is a cone, we take $\widetilde{l}' = \widetilde{l}$.

Applying the functor σ_*, the previous diagram becomes

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & & \\
 & \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q,Y}^{\oplus 2} \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q,Y}^{\oplus 2} \arrow[d] & & \\
0 \arrow[r] & K_x \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{I}_{P,Y}^{\oplus 2} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{I}_{l,Q} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{I}_{l',Q}(-H) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{O}_Q(-H)^{\oplus 2} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{I}_{l,Q} \arrow[r] & 0. \\
 & 0 & 0 & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Considering the first column of the previous diagram we can also see K_x as the following extension

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & & \\
 & \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q,Y} \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q,Y} \arrow[d] & & \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q,Y}^{\oplus 2} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & K_x \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{I}_{l',Q}(-H) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q,Y} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & T \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathcal{I}_{l',Q}(-H) \arrow[r] & 0, \\
 & 0 & 0 & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where T corresponds to an element in $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{I}_{l',Q}(-H), \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q,Y})$. To compute this class observe that, since $P \cup Q$ is a complete intersection in Y, we have the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(-2H) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{O}_Y(-H)^{\oplus 2} \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q,Y} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where α is the multiplication by the equations of two hyperplanes in Y.

Thus, applying the exact functor $\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{I}_{l',Q}(-H), -)$ to such a sequence and taking cohomology, we get

$$0 \to \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{I}_{l',Q}(-H), \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q,Y}) \to \mathbb{C}^2 \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathbb{C}^{12} \to \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{I}_{l',Q}(-H), \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q,Y}) \to 0,$$

as $\dim \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{I}_{l',Q}(-H), \mathcal{O}_Y(-2H)) = 2$ and $\dim \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{I}_{l',Q}(-H), \mathcal{O}_Y(-H)) = 6$.

Of course, $\varphi = \alpha[2] \circ (-)$ and so it vanishes. By Serre duality, $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{I}_{l',Q}(-H), \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q,Y}) \cong H^0(Q, \mathcal{I}_{l,Q}(H)) \cong \mathbb{C}^2$. Thus $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{I}_{l',Q}(-H), \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q,Y})$ gets identified to the 1-dimensional linear system of lines l' in Q and $T = \mathcal{I}_{P\cup l',Y}$.

The fact that the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \widetilde{K}_x \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)^{\oplus 2} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}} \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}} \longrightarrow 0$$

does not split implies that (4.3.8) and (4.3.9) are non-split as well. ☐

From Lemma 4.3, we can deduce in a standard way the following Chern characters, by using Grothendieck–Riemann–Roch:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q_{f(x)},Y}) &= (1,0,-H^2,3l,-\tfrac{7}{4}),\\
\mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{I}_{P\cup l'_x,Y}) &= (1,0,-P,-l,-\tfrac{7}{4}),\\
\mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{O}_Y(-H)^{\oplus 2}) &= (2,-2H,H^2,-l,\tfrac{1}{4}),\\
\mathrm{ch}(K_x) &= (2,0,-P-H^2,2l,0),\\
\mathrm{ch}(M_x) &= (4,-2H,-P,l,\tfrac{1}{4}).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 4.2.

4.4. A family of stable ACM vector bundles.

The aim of this section is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 4.4. *For all $x \in S_{\mathrm{reg}}$, the sheaf M_x is a Gieseker stable ACM bundle on Y.*

The proof is divided in two steps.

Step 1: ACM bundle. In order to prove that M_x is an ACM bundle, we want to apply Lemma 1.9. Hence, we need:

$$\begin{aligned}
&H^1(Y, M_x(H)) = 0\\
&H^1(Y, M_x(-3H)) = H^2(Y, M_x(-3H)) = H^3(Y, M_x(-3H)) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

These vanishing will be proved in Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.7.

Lemma 4.5. *For $x \in S_{\mathrm{reg}}$, we have $H^1(Y, M_x(mH)) = H^2(Y, M_x(mH)) = 0$, for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. From (4.3.7), by tensoring by $\mathcal{O}_Y(mH)$ and taking cohomology, we get

$$H^p(Y, M_x(mH)) = H^p(Y, K_x(mH)) \qquad \text{for } p = 1,2 \text{ and for all } m \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

To compute the cohomology of $K_x(mH)$, we want to use (4.3.8). As above, we take the tensor product $\mathcal{O}_Y(mH)$ and then cohomology. Thus we get

$$H^1(Y, \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q}(mH))^{\oplus 2} \to H^1(Y, K_x(mH)) \to H^1(Y, \mathcal{I}_{l',Q}((m-1)H)) \to H^2(Y, \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q}(mH))^{\oplus 2}$$

By using the Koszul resolution of $\mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q}$, we have the vanishings

$$H^1(Y, \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q}(mH)) = H^2(Y, \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q}(mH)) = 0.$$

From the matrix factorization presentation (4.3.4), we have $H^1(Y, \mathcal{I}_{l',Q}((m-1)H)) = 0$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, $H^1(Y, M_x(mH)) = 0$.

To conclude the proof of the lemma we only need to show that $H^2(Y, K_x(-mH)) = 0$. Since K_x is defined as the kernel of the evaluation map $\mathcal{I}_{P,Y}^{\oplus 2} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}} \mathcal{I}_{l,Q}$, we have an inclusion $H^2(Y, K_x(-mH)) \hookrightarrow H^2(Y, \mathcal{I}_{P,Y}(-mH))^{\oplus 2}$ and $H^2(Y, \mathcal{I}_{P,Y}(-mH)) = 0$. ☐

In order to prove the crucial vanishing, $H^3(Y, M_x(-3H)) = 0$, we set

$$N := \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H)}(\mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-3H)}(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H-h)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H+h)). \tag{4.4.1}$$

Lemma 4.6. *The object $N \in \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\widetilde{Y})$ lies in the following distinguished triangle*

$$\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-H+h)[3] \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow \sigma^*\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}(3H)|_Y\,[1].$$

Proof. First we consider the right mutation of $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H-h)$ with respect to $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-3H)$, that is

$$\operatorname{cone}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H-h) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}^\vee} \mathrm{RHom}(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H-h), \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-3H))^\vee \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-3H)\right)[-1].$$

Using Serre duality we have that $\mathrm{Ext}^p(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H-h), \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-3H))^\vee$ is 1-dimensional if $p = 4$ and it is trivial otherwise. Hence we have the distinguished triangle

$$\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H-h) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}^\vee} \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-3H)[4] \to \mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-3H)}(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H-h))[1]$$

which, after tensorization by $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H+h)$ and shift, becomes

$$\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-H+h)[3] \to \mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-3H)}(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H-h)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H+h) \to \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(3H). \tag{4.4.2}$$

Now we want to compute the left mutation of the middle term in (4.4.2) with respect to $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H)$. To this end, we compute the left mutations of the first and third term in the same distinguished triangle. Now, an easy computation shows that $\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H)}(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-H+h)[3]) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-H+h)[3]$.

On the other hand, the vector space $\mathrm{Ext}^p(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H), \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(3H))$ is 6-dimensional if $p = 0$ and trivial otherwise. Thus we get a distinguished triangle

$$\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H)^{\oplus 6} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}} \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(3H) \longrightarrow \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H)}(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(3H)).$$

Hence $\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H)}(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(3H))[-1] \cong \sigma^*\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}(3H)|_Y$ and putting all together we get the desired conclusion. □

Finally we can prove the following.

Lemma 4.7. *For $x \in S_{\mathrm{reg}}$, we have $H^3(Y, M_x(-3H)) = 0$.*

Proof. Using adjunction (see, in particular, Lemma 1.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
H^3(Y, M_x(-3H)) &= \mathrm{Hom}^2_{\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(Y)}(\mathcal{O}_Y(3H), \Xi_4^{-1}(L_x)) \\
&= \mathrm{Hom}^2_{\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\widetilde{Y})}(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(3H), \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)}\mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)}\Phi(L_x)) \\
&= \mathrm{Hom}^2_{\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)}(\Psi(\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H)}(\mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-3H)}(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(H-h)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(2H+h))), L_x) \\
&= \mathrm{Hom}^2_{\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{B}_0)}(\Psi(N), L_x).
\end{aligned}$$

where N is defined in (4.4.1). By [43, Lem 2.3], we have $\Psi(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-H+h)) = 0$. Therefore, by Lemma 4.6,

$$\Psi(N) \cong \Psi(\sigma^*\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}(3H)|_{\widetilde{Y}})[1],$$

and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} H^3(Y, M_x(-3H)) &\cong \mathrm{Hom}^1_{\mathrm{D^b}(\mathbb{P}^2,\mathcal{B}_0)}(\Psi(\sigma^*\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}(3H)|_{\widetilde{Y}}, L_x) \\ &= \mathrm{Ext}^1_{\widetilde{Y}}(\sigma^*\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}(3H)|_{\widetilde{Y}}, \mathcal{I}_{\widetilde{l},\widetilde{Q}}) \\ &= \mathrm{Ext}^1_{Y}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^5}(3H)|_{Y}, \mathcal{I}_{l,Q}) \\ &= H^1(Q, \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^5}(-3H)|_Q \otimes \mathcal{I}_{l,Q}) \\ &\cong H^1(Q, \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-3H)|_Q \otimes \mathcal{I}_{l,Q}) \oplus H^1(Q, \mathcal{I}_{l,Q}(-2H))^{\oplus 2}. \end{aligned}$$

The last isomorphism follows from the fact that $Q \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^5} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \cong \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(H)^{\oplus 2}$.

From the matrix factorization presentation (4.3.4), we have $H^1(Q, \mathcal{I}_{l,Q}(-2H)) = 0$. Hence, to conclude the proof of the lemma we only need to show $H^1(Q, \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-3H) \otimes \mathcal{I}_{l,Q}) = 0$.

The Euler sequence on $\mathbb{P}^3$ restricted to the quadric and twisted by $\mathcal{I}_{l,Q}(-3H)$ becomes

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{l,Q}(-3H) \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{l,Q}(-2H)^{\oplus 4} \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-3H) \otimes \mathcal{I}_{l,Q} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Taking cohomology we see that $H^1(Q, \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-3H) \otimes \mathcal{I}_{l,Q})$ is the kernel of the morphism

$$H^2(Q, \mathcal{I}_{l,Q}(-3H)) \xrightarrow{\alpha} H^2(Q, \mathcal{I}_{l,Q}(-2H)^{\oplus 4}).$$

Hence, we need to show that α is injective. Consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{l,Q} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Q(H)^{\oplus 2} \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{l',Q}(H) \longrightarrow 0.$$

By taking cohomology and using that $H^1(Q, \mathcal{I}_{l',Q}(-2H)) = H^1(Q, \mathcal{I}_{l',Q}(-H)) = 0$, we have that α sits in the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} H^2(Q, \mathcal{O}_Q(-3H)^{\oplus 2}) \arrow[r, "\beta"] & H^2(Q, \mathcal{O}_Q(-2H)^{\oplus 8}) \\ H^2(Q, \mathcal{I}_{l,Q}(-3H)) \arrow[r, "\alpha"] \arrow[u, hook] & H^2(Q, \mathcal{I}_{l,Q}(-2H)^{\oplus 4}). \arrow[u, hook] \end{tikzcd}$$

Thus, to prove that α is injective is enough to show that β is such. By construction, $\beta = H^2(f)^{\oplus 2}$ where $H^2(f)$ is the morphism induced on cohomology by the map f sitting in the following Koszul exact sequence on Q

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Q(-3H) \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{O}_Q(-2H)^{\oplus 4} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Q(-H)^{\oplus 6} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Q^{\oplus 4} \xrightarrow{g} \mathcal{O}_Q(H) \longrightarrow 0.$$

The cokernel of f is $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-3H) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Q$ and the kernel of g is $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3}(H) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Q$. Chasing through the associated long exact sequence in cohomology, we get $H^1(Q, \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-3H) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Q) = H^0(Q, \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3}(H) \otimes \mathcal{O}_Q) = 0$, since $H^0(Q, \mathcal{O}_Q^{\oplus 4}) \to H^0(Q, \mathcal{O}_Q(H))$ is a base change of the evaluation map. Hence, $H^2(f)$ is injective. ☐

Step 2: Gieseker stability. Now we finish the proof of Proposition 4.4 by showing that, again for all $x \in S_{\mathrm{reg}}$, the ACM bundle M_x is stable. Note that $\mu(K_x) = 0$, $\mu(M_x) = -\frac{1}{2}$, and by (4.3.9), K_x is μ-semistable.

Suppose M_x is not stable. Since M_x is a vector bundle, there exists F a semistable destabilizing reflexive sheaf and a sheaf G sitting in a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow M_x \longrightarrow G \longrightarrow 0$$

with $\mu(F) \geqslant -\frac{1}{2}$. Now $\mathrm{rk}(F) = 1, 2, 3$ and the three cases need to be analysed separately.

Case A: $\mathrm{rk}(F) = 1$. Then $\mathrm{c}_1(F) \geqslant 0$ and F is a line bundle. Moreover, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
F \arrow[d, hook] \arrow[dr, hook, "\phi"] & \\
M_x \arrow[r, two heads] & K_x.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since F is torsion free, the composition ϕ can only vanish or be an injection. If ϕ is trivial, then it factors through $\mathcal{O}_Y(-H)^{\oplus 2}$ which is semistable with $\mu = -1$. Thus we get a contradiction. So assume that ϕ is injective and consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & F \arrow[d, hook, "\phi"] \arrow[dr, "\varphi"] & \\
\mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q,Y} \arrow[r, hook] & K_x \arrow[r, two heads] & \mathcal{I}_{P\cup l',Y}.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Again, F cannot inject neither in $\mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q,Y}$ nor in $\mathcal{I}_{P\cup l',Y}$, and we get a contradiction.

Case B: $\mathrm{rk}(F) = 2$. In this case $c_1(F) \geqslant -1$ and we have a commutative diagram

(4.4.3)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
F_1 \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d, hook] & F \arrow[r, two heads] \arrow[d, hook] & F_2 \arrow[d, hook] \\
\mathcal{O}_Y(-H)^{\oplus 2} \arrow[r, hook] & M_x \arrow[r, two heads] & K_x.
\end{tikzcd}$$

At this point we have to analyse some additional cases.

Case B.1: $\mathrm{rk}(F_1) = 2$. Since K_x is torsion free, $F_2 = 0$. On the other hand, $O_Y(-H)^{\oplus 2}$ is semistable, so $c_1(F_1) \leqslant -2$. Then $c_1(F) \leqslant -2$, so $\mu(F) \leqslant -1$ and F does not destabilize M_x.

Case B.2: $\mathrm{rk}(F_1) = \mathrm{rk}(F_2) = 1$. In that situation, $c_1(F_1) = -1$, so $F_1 \cong G$. On the other hand, by the uniqueness of graded object which is the direct sum of the the Jordan–Hölder factors and the fact that (4.3.9) does not split, $F_2 \cong \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q}$. Thus (4.4.3) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{O}_Y(-H) \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d, hook] & F \arrow[r, two heads] \arrow[d, hook] & \mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q} \arrow[d, hook] \\
\mathcal{O}_Y(-H)^{\oplus 2} \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d] & M_x \arrow[r, two heads] \arrow[d] & K_x \arrow[d] \\
\mathcal{O}_Y(-H) \arrow[r, hook] & G \arrow[r, two heads] & \mathcal{I}_{P\cup l'}.
\end{tikzcd}$$

In that case, $\mathrm{ch}_2(F) = \mathrm{ch}_2(\mathcal{O}_Y(-H)) + \mathrm{ch}_2(\mathcal{I}_{P\cup Q,Y}) = \frac{H^2}{2} - (P+Q) = -\frac{H^2}{2}$. Since $\mathrm{ch}_2(M_x) = -P = -\frac{H^2}{3} > -\frac{H^2}{2}$, F does not destabilize M_x.

Case B.3: $\mathrm{rk}(F_2) = 2$. In that case, $F_2 \cong K_x$. Thus (4.3.7) splits, which gives a contradiction.

Case C: $\mathrm{rk}(F) = 3$. Now $c_1(F) \geqslant -1$ and we can consider again a diagram as (4.4.3). We can distinguish two possibilities.

Case C.1: $\mathrm{rk}(F_2) = 2$. Since F is semistable, $-\frac{1}{3} \leqslant \mu(F) \leqslant \mu(F_2) \leqslant \mu(K_x) = 0$. As $2\mu(F_2)$ is an integer, $\mu(F_2) = c_1(F_2) = 0$, $F_1 \cong \mathcal{O}_Y(-H)$ and $c_1(F) = -1$. Hence we rewrite again (4.4.3) as

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{O}_Y(-H) \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d, hook] & F \arrow[r, two heads] \arrow[d, hook] & F_2 \arrow[d, hook] \\
\mathcal{O}_Y(-H)^{\oplus 2} \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d, two heads] & M_x \arrow[r, two heads] \arrow[d, two heads] & K_x \arrow[d, two heads] \\
\mathcal{O}_Y(-H) \arrow[r, hook] & G \arrow[r, two heads] & T.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since G is a torsion-free sheaf of rank 1 and $c_1(G) = 0$, if $\mathcal{O}_Y(-H) \ncong G$, then T is supported on H, and so $c_1(T) = 1$, contradicting $c_1(F_2) = c_1(K_x) = 0$. Hence $G \cong \mathcal{O}_Y(-H)$ contradicting the fact that M_x is non-split.

Case C.2: $\mathrm{rk}(F_2) = 1$. Since $O_Y(-H)^{\oplus 2}$ is semistable, $c_1(F_1) \leqslant -2$. On the other hand, also K_x is semistable, so $c_1(F_2) \leqslant 0$. Then $c_1(F) \leqslant -2$ and $\mu(F) \leqslant -\frac{2}{3}$. Therefore, F does not destabilize M_x.

This completes the proof of Proposition 4.4. In particular, we proved that S is the closure of a component of the moduli space of stable ACM bundles with Chern character $(4, -2H, -P, l, \frac{1}{4})$.

4.5. **Universal family.** In this section we assume that S is smooth. Then the above discussion can be summarized by saying that there exists a twisted universal family $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbf{Coh}(S \times Y, p_1^*\alpha)$ such that the Fourier–Mukai functor

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathrm{D^b}(S, \alpha) \to \mathrm{D^b}(Y)$$

is fully faithful and it factors through $\mathbf{T}_Y$. Recall that $\Phi_{\mathcal{M}}(-) := (p_Y)_*(\mathcal{M} \otimes p_S^*(-))$.

As the Kuznetsov's functor providing the full embedding of $\mathrm{D^b}(S, \alpha)$ into $\mathrm{D^b}(Y)$ is a composition of a Fourier–Mukai functor and mutations, finding $\mathcal{M}$ amounts to finding the Fourier–Mukai kernel of their composition. For this, consider

$$\mathcal{S} := (\sigma \times \mathrm{id})_* \left(p_{\widetilde{Y}}^* \mathcal{E}' \otimes_{p_{\widetilde{Y}}^* \pi^* \mathcal{B}_0} (\pi \times \mathrm{id})^* (f \times \mathrm{id})_* (p_1^* E_\alpha^\vee \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_S}) \right)$$

where $p_{\widetilde{Y}} : \widetilde{Y} \times S \to \widetilde{Y}$ is the natural projection, $p_1 : S \times S \to S$ is the projection on the first factor, $\Delta_S \subset S \times S$ is the diagonal, and $\mathcal{E}'$ is defined in (1.3.1). From (4.3.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}|_{Y \times \{x\}} &\cong \sigma_* \left(p_{\widetilde{Y}}^* \mathcal{E}' \otimes_{p_{\widetilde{Y}}^* \pi^* \mathcal{B}_0} (\pi \times \mathrm{id})^* (f \times \mathrm{id})_* (p_1^* E_\alpha^\vee \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_S}) \right) \Big|_{\widetilde{Y} \times \{x\}} \\
&\cong \sigma_* \left(\mathcal{E}' \otimes_{\pi^* \mathcal{B}_0} \pi^* \left((f \times \mathrm{id})_* (p_1^* E_\alpha^\vee \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_S}) \right) |_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \{x\}} \right) \\
&\cong \sigma_* \left(\mathcal{E}' \otimes_{\pi^* \mathcal{B}_0} \pi^* f_* \left(E_\alpha^\vee \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_S}|_{S \times \{x\}} \right) \right) \\
&\cong \sigma_* \left(\mathcal{E}' \otimes_{\pi^* \mathcal{B}_0} \pi^* f_* \left(E_\alpha^\vee \otimes \mathbb{C}(x) \right) \right) \\
&\cong \sigma_* \Phi(L_x) \\
&\cong \mathcal{I}_{l_x, Q_{f(x)}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, the universal family $\mathcal{M}$ over $Y \times S$ such that $\mathcal{M}|_{Y \times \{x\}} \cong M_x$ can be described as

$$\mathcal{M} := (\sigma \times \mathrm{id})_* \circ \mathbf{L}_{p_{\widetilde{Y}}^* \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)} \circ \mathbf{R}_{p_{\widetilde{Y}}^* \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)} \circ (\sigma \times \mathrm{id})^* \mathcal{S}[-1],$$

where $\mathbf{L}_{p_{\widetilde{Y}}^*\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(h-H)}$ and $\mathbf{R}_{p_{\widetilde{Y}}^*\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{Y}}(-h)}$ denote the corresponding left and right mutations.

The fact that $\mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(S \times Y, p_1^*\alpha)$ is actually a locally free sheaf follows from the fact that $\mathcal{M}|_{x\times Y} \cong M_x$ is locally free, for all $x \in S$. This was observed in Section 4.4.

Acknowledgements. It is a pleasure to thank Nick Addington, Asher Auel, Marcello Bernardara, Robin Hartshorne, Daniel Huybrechts, Nathan Ilten, Sukhendu Mehrotra, Nicolas Perrin, Antonio Rapagnetta, and Pawel Sosna for very useful conversations and comments. Parts of this paper were written while the three authors were visiting the University of Utah, the University of Bonn, the Ohio State University, and the University of Barcelona. The warm hospitality from these institutions is gratefully acknowledged.

References

[1] N. Addington, *The Derived Category of the Intersection of Four Quadrics*, PhD Thesis, Madison.

[2] N. Addington and R. Thomas, *Hodge theory and derived categories of cubic fourfolds*, arXiv:1211.3758.

[3] D. Abramovich, T. Graber, A. Vistoli, *Gromov-Witten theory of Deligne-Mumford stacks*, Amer. J. Math. **130** (2008), 1337–1398.

[4] E. Arrondo, *A Home-Made Hartshorne–Serre Correspondence*, Rev. Mat. Complut. **20** (2007), 423–443.

[5] E. Arrondo, B. Graña, *Vector bundles on $G(1,4)$ without intermediate cohomology*, J. Algebra **214** (1999), 128–142.

[6] E. Arrondo, C. Madonna, *Curves and vector bundles on quartic threefolds*, J. Korean Math. Soc. **46** (2009), 589–607.

[7] A. Bayer, E. Macrì, *Projectivity and birational geometry of Bridgeland moduli spaces*, arXiv:1203.4613.

[8] A. Bayer, E. Macrì, *The space of stability conditions on the local projective plane*, Duke Math. J. **160** (2011), 263–322.

[9] A. Beauville, *Variétés de Prym et jacobiennes intermédiaires*, Ann. Sci. Ec. Norm. Sup. **10** (1977), 309–391.

[10] A. Beauville, *Sous-variétés spéciales des variétés de Prym*, Compositio Math. **45** (1981), 357–383.

[11] A. Beauville, *Vector bundles on the cubic threefold*, in: Symposium in Honor of C.H. Clemens (Salt Lake City, 2000), Contemp. Math., vol. 312, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence (2002), 71–86.

[12] M. Bernardara, M. Bolognesi, *Derived categories and rationality of conic bundles*, arXiv:1010.2417.

[13] M. Bernardara, E. Macrì, S. Mehrotra, P. Stellari, *A categorical invariant for cubic threefolds*, Adv. Math. **229** (2012), 770–803.

[14] I. Biswas, J. Biswas, G.V. Ravindra, *On some moduli spaces of stable vector bundles on cubic and quartic threefolds*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **212** (2008), 2298–2306.

[15] M.C. Brambilla, D. Faenzi, *Moduli spaces of arithmetically Cohen–Macaulay bundles on Fano manifolds of the principal series*, Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. **2** (2009), 71–91.

[16] T. Bridgeland, *Stability conditions on K3 surfaces*, Duke Math. J. **141** (2008), 241–291.

[17] T. Bridgeland, *Stability conditions on triangulated categories*, Ann. Math. **166** (2007), 317–346.

[18] C. Cadman, *Using stacks to impose tangency conditions on curves*, Amer. J. Math. **129** (2007), 405–427.

[19] A. Căldăraru, *Derived categories of twisted sheaves on Calabi-Yau manifolds*, PhD-Thesis, Cornell University (2000).

[20] M. Casanellas, R. Hartshorne, *ACM bundles on cubic surfaces*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. **13** (2011), 709–731.

[21] M. Casanellas, R. Hartshorne, F. Gleiss, F.-O. Schreyer, *Stable Ulrich bundles*, to appear in: Int. J. Math., arXiv:1102.0878.

[22] L. Chiantini, D. Faenzi, *Rank 2 arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay bundles on a general quintic surface*, Math. Nachr. **282** (2009), 1691–1708.

[23] L. Chiantini, C. K. Madonna, *ACM bundles on general hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{P}^5$ of low degree*, Collect. Math. **56** (2005), 85–96.

[24] C.H. Clemens, P. Griffiths, *The intermediate Jacobian of the cubic threefold*, Ann. Math. **95** (1972), 281–356.

[25] S. Druel, *Espace des modules des faisceaux de rang 2 semi-stables de classes de Chern* $c_1 = 0$, $c_2 = 2$ *et* $c_3 = 0$ *sur la cubique de* $\mathbb{P}^4$, Internat. Math. Res. Notices **2000**, 985–1004.

[26] D. Eisenbud, *Homological algebra on a complete intersection, with an application to group representations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **260** (1980), 35–64.

[27] J. Herzog, B. Ulrich, J. Backelin, *Linear maximal Cohen–Macaulay modules over strict complete intersections*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **71** (1991), 187–202.

[28] D. Huybrechts, *Fourier–Mukai transforms in algebraic geometry*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs (2006).

[29] D. Huybrechts, M. Lehn, *The geometry of moduli spaces of sheaves*, Cambridge Mathematical Library, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, (2010).

[30] A. Iliev, *Minimal sections of conic bundles*, Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. **8** (1999), 401–428.

[31] A. Iliev, D. Markushevich, *The Abel-Jacobi map for a cubic threefold and periods of Fano threefolds of degree 14*, Doc. Math. **5** (2000), 23–47.

[32] D. Kaledin, M. Lehn, C. Sorger, *Singular symplectic moduli spaces*, Invent. Math. **164** (2006), 591–614.

[33] M. Kontsevich, Y. Soibelman, *Stability structures, motivic Donaldson-Thomas invariants and cluster transformations*, arXiv:0811.2435.

[34] A. Kuznetsov, *Derived category of a cubic threefold and the variety* V_{14}, Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. **246** (2004), 171–194.

[35] A. Kuznetsov, *Derived categories of cubic fourfolds*, in: Cohomological and geometric approaches to rationality problems, 219–243, Progr. Math. **282**, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston (2010).

[36] A. Kuznetsov, *Derived categories of quadric fibrations and intersections of quadrics*, Adv. Math. **218** (2008), 1340–1369.

[37] A. Kuznetsov, *Homological projective duality*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **105** (2007), 157–220.

[38] A. Kuznetsov, *Instanton bundles on Fano threefolds*, Cent. Eur. J. Math. **10** (2012), 1198–1231.

[39] A. Kuznetsov, D. Markushevich, *Symplectic structures on moduli spaces of sheaves via the Atiyah class*, J. Geom. Phys. **59** (2009), 843–860.

[40] M. Lahoz, J.C. Naranjo, *Theta-duality on Prym varieties and a Torelli theorem*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., S 0002-9947(2013)05675-9.

[41] M. Lieblich, *Moduli of twisted sheaves*, Duke Math. J. **138** (2007), 23–118.

[42] M. Lieblich, *Moduli of complexes on a proper morphism*, J. Alg. Geom. **15** (2006), 175–206.

[43] E. Macrì, P. Stellari, *Fano varieties of cubic fourfolds containing a plane*, Math. Ann. **354** (2012), 1147–1176.

[44] C. Madonna, *Rank-two vector bundles on general quartic hypersurfaces in* $\mathbb{P}^4$, Rev. Mat. Complut. **13** (2000), 287–301.

[45] C. Madonna, *Rank 4 vector bundles on the quintic threefold*, Cent. Eur. J. Math. **3** (2005), 404–411.

[46] D. Markushevich, A. S. Tikhomirov, *The Abel–Jacobi map of a moduli component of vector bundles on the cubic threefold*, J. Algebraic Geom. **10** (2001), 37–62.

[47] J.S. Milne, *Étale Cohomology*, Princeton Mathematical Series **33**, Princeton University Press (1980).

[48] R.M. Miró-Roig, J. Pons–Llopis, *N-dimensional Fano varieties of wild representation type*, arXiv:1011.3704.

[49] D. Orlov, *Derived categories of coherent sheaves and triangulated categories of singularities*, Algebra, arithmetic, and geometry: in honor of Yu.I. Manin, Vol. II, 503–531, Progr. Math., 270, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston (2009).

[50] D. Orlov, *Projective bundles, monoidal transformations, and derived categories of coherent sheaves*, Russian Acad. Sci. Izv. Math. **41** (1993), 133–141.

[51] J. Pons–Llopis, F. Tonini, *ACM bundles on Del Pezzo surfaces*, Le Matematiche **64** (2009), 177–211.

[52] C. Simpson, *Moduli of representations of the fundamental group of a smooth projective variety I*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **79** (1994), 47–129.

[53] J. Starr, *Rational curves on hypersurfaces*, PhD thesis, Harvard University, 2000.

[54] Y. Toda, *Moduli stacks and invariants of semistable objects on K3 surfaces*, Adv. Math. **217**, 2736–2781 (2008).

[55] Y. Toda, *Stability conditions and extremal contractions*, arXiv:1204.0602.

[56] Y. Yoshino, *Cohen–Macaulay modules over Cohen–Macaulay rings*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. **146**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge (1990).

[57] K. Yoshioka, *Moduli spaces of twisted sheaves on a projective variety*, in: Moduli spaces and arithmetic geometry, Adv. Stud. Pure Math. **45** (2006), 1–30.

M.L.: Département de Mathématiques d'Orsay, Université Paris-Sud 11, Bâtiment 425, F-91405 Orsay, France
E-mail address: `marti.lahoz@math.u-psud.fr`
URL: http://www.math.u-psud.fr/~lahoz/

E.M.: Department of Mathematics, The Ohio State University, 231 W 18th Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210, USA
E-mail address: `macri.6@math.osu.edu`
URL: http://www.math.osu.edu/~macri.6/

P.S.: Dipartimento di Matematica "F. Enriques", Università degli Studi di Milano, Via Cesare Saldini 50, 20133 Milano, Italy
E-mail address: `paolo.stellari@unimi.it`
URL: http://users.mat.unimi.it/users/stellari/